DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 106 EA 003 044

AUTHOR	Blackmer, Alan R.
TITLE	An Inquiry into Student Unrest in Independent Secondary Schools.
INSTITUTION	National Association of Independent Schools, Boston, Mass.
PUB DATE	Feb 70
NOTE	92p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association of Independent Schools, Four Liberty Square, Boston, Massachusetts 02109 ($2.50)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.70
DESCRIPTORS	Activism, High School Students, *Student Alienation, *Student Attitudes, Student Problems, Student School Relationship

ABSTRACT

This report focuses on the nature and forms of student unrest in a sample of schools that make up the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS). Although not limited to one type of NAIS school, this study emphasizes boarding schools of the New England and Middle Atlantic States since evidence of student unrest is greater in these schools. Some of the data for the study were obtained from responses to letters sent to directors, faculties, students, and parents representing 115 randomly selected private secondary schools. (JF)

ED043106

AN INQUIRY INTO STUDENT UNREST IN INDEPENDENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Esther Osgood
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

By
Alan R. Blackmer
Dean of the Faculty, Emeritus
Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts
and
Research Associate
A Study of the American Independent School

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EA 003 044

February 1970
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS
Four Liberty Square, Boston, Massachusetts 02109

COPYRIGHT © 1970, BY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote brief passages in a review to be printed in a magazine or newspaper.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
FOREWORD		5
Chapter I.	THE SEARCH FOR AN EXPLANATION	9
	FOOTNOTES	17
Chapter II.	PERSPECTIVES	21
	FOOTNOTES	27
Chapter III.	STUDENT DESIRE FOR A "VOICE" IN DECISION-MAKING	29
	FOOTNOTES	39
Chapter IV.	PLUS AND MINUS: THE DISSENTING VIEW	41
	FOOTNOTES	51
Chapter V.	FROM ABSTRACT TO CONCRETE: STUDENT REFORM PROGRAMS	53
	FOOTNOTES	61
Chapter VI.	VARIED SCHOOL RESPONSES	63
	FOOTNOTES	72
Chapter VII.	WHAT OF THE FUTURE?	75
	FOOTNOTES	82
APPENDIX		83

FOREWORD

THE focus of the following report is on the nature and forms of student disenchantment and unrest in a sample of schools which make up the National Association of Independent Schools. NAIS is an association of 772 private elementary and secondary schools and 42 member associations organized to assist its schools to serve their students with maximum effectiveness. Within this relatively small group of schools exists a tremendous diversity: elementary and secondary schools in many regions of the country, day and boarding, secular and church-related. Although not limited to one type of NAIS school, this study has placed its emphasis on schools of the Northeast, i.e., New England and the Middle Atlantic states, particularly on boarding schools, because the available evidence indicated more student unrest — or more manifestation of it — in these schools than in day schools and those in other parts of the country, except possibly the West Coast.

The investigation grew out of the interest in the problem taken in the fall of 1968 by the Educational Practices Committee of the National Association of Independent Schools. It was the conviction of this group of heads of schools that the most constructive way to meet current student restlessness was, first, to open it to the fullest discussion possible and then to gather and exchange information about effective school responses to the problem in the hope that such exchange might be helpful to all schools, even those which thus far have experienced little student discontent. The study, although possessing independent status, was placed under the aegis of *A Study of the American Independent School,* whose purpose is to describe and assess the role of the nonpublic school in the totality of the national educational effort.

At its inception, the NAIS Educational Practices Committee described the purpose of this study, then called "Student Concerns and Institutional Responses," as follows:

> It is in response to the desire of school heads and teachers to understand fully and react effectively to the emerging, often critical questions of young people today concerning the quality of their education, the

quality of the society of which they are a part, and the extent of their responsibility for strengthening both. The study is based on the belief that forces in contemporary society, many of them worldwide, are shaping a young generation with a distinctive outlook and life style whose potential for constructive, creative action (as well as for dissent) presents schools with exciting educational opportunities of new proportions.

Limited to activities of the schools in the regular academic year, September to June, the report does not cover their summer sessions, at home and abroad, which so effectively have met student demands for varied and relevant programs of study, travel, and work experience.

Some of the data for this study were obtained from responses by the heads, faculties, students, and parents of 115 private secondary schools to separate questionnaires prepared, with professional help, by the staff of *A Study of the American Independent School.* These schools were randomly selected and included all the main types of nonpublic schools, many of them with specific religious affiliations, the two largest groups being Roman Catholic and Lutheran.

In an Appendix, and from time to time in the text, comparisons are made between NAIS schools and other types or associations of schools with respect to the nature of student unrest. But it was not possible in this study to obtain sufficient accurate information about student attitudes in widely varying nonpublic schools — over 19,000 of them — to include them in any significant way in this report.

In addition to wide-ranging reading in the current literature of campus unrest and interviews with students, teachers, and administrators in independent schools, other sources of data on which this study is based were the following:

1. Seventy-five letters from heads of schools in answer to our request for information concerning constructive ways in which their schools have responded to student concerns
2. Student comment in the student-edited newspapers, for 1968-1969, of over one hundred independent schools
3. Reports from the staff of *A Study of the American Independent School* on day-long visits to fifty nonpublic schools in eighteen states and the District of Columbia, involving meetings with the head of each, a group of the school's faculty, and a group of its students, both groups randomly selected
4. Attendance at the following conferences:

"Student Activism and the Relevancy of Schooling," sponsored by the College Entrance Examination Board, the Danforth Foundation, and IDEA, Atlanta, Georgia, November 21-22, 1968

"Student Unrest: Threat or Promise?", sponsored by the Associa-

tion for Supervision and Curriculum Development of the National Education Association, Atlanta, Georgia, April 16-19, 1969

"Student Concerns and Institutional Response," sponsored by the National Association of Independent Schools, Boston, Massachusetts, January 13-14, 1969

Second Conference on "Student Concerns and Institutional Response," sponsored by the National Association of Independent Schools, Fort Washington, Pennsylvania, May 4-6, 1969

"The Youth Revolution," The Forty-first Annual Harvard Conference on Educational Administration, Cambridge, Massachusetts, July 17-18, 1969.

By way of acknowledgment of debts, we are first of all grateful to the many heads of schools who responded so fully and so generously to our request for information about the kinds of contemporary student unrest they have encountered and their response to it.

Special thanks also go to Professor and Mrs. Livingston Hall, without whose keen interest and support this study would not have been initiated; to the President, staff, and Educational Practices Committee of the National Association of Independent Schools for their steady encouragement; to the staff of *A Study of the American Independent School,* and particularly to its secretary, Ann Couch, and to its Director, Dr. Otto F. Kraushaar, for unfailingly helpful insights and counsel; to Philip Burnham of St. Paul's School, and Simeon Hyde, Jr., of Phillips Academy for significant contributions toward improvement of the text; and to the foundations which so generously supplied the means to make the study possible: The Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, The Kettering Family Foundation, The Kenneth F. Montgomery Charitable Foundation; and the Sperry and Hutchinson Foundation for its support of the continuing work of the NAIS Educational Practices Committee.

"We see around us racial conflict, continued poverty and malnutrition in an age of unparalleled prosperity and seemingly unlimited promise. We are confronted by pollution of our environment, decay of our cities, the continuation of wars and the threat of war, and everywhere vague but widespread discontent with the general quality of life."

"A Declaration of Campus Unrest"
From a Report of a Conference of university administrators sponsored by the American Council on Education, April 1969.[1]

"Something has gone sour in teaching and learning. It's almost as though there were a widespread feeling that education has become irrelevant. . . . I think I know what is bothering the students. I think what we are up against is a generation that is by no means sure that it has a future."

Professor George Wald,
Harvard University[2]

CHAPTER I

THE SEARCH FOR AN EXPLANATION

D. W. BROGAN has written of the current, worldwide student unrest: "There is no precedent known to me of the scale, the universality, the passion of the present discontents."[3]* A detailed review of this profoundly disturbing phenomenon is not within the compass of this investigation. It has already been amply reported and analyzed, with more extensive and intensive studies to follow. Yet, before coming to the principal concern of this report, student unrest in certain of the independent schools of the land, we shall pause to survey the insights of close, sensitive, competent observers into the discontent and alienation of many college students today.

A compelling reason for this approach is suggested by an experienced private school headmaster: "So far, the storms have tended to center in the colleges, but there is no reason to believe that the schools will escape their path. . . . Every schoolmaster knows that the patterns set by college students, whether in dress, behavior, or thought, tend to repeat themselves in due course, at the secondary level."[4] With all their differences, perhaps as never before in our history today's young people are part of a distinctive, remarkably cohesive youth subculture, bound together by similar attitudes, values, customs, and tastes, a culture which has become a highly significant force in American life. Its existence suggests the probability that attitudes of secondary school students can become intelligible only within the context of an awareness of the mood and temper of the next older generation of college youth.

In spite of the impression conveyed by the mass media, the majority of the nation's college and university campuses have been outwardly peaceful and quiet. There are large numbers of happy, adjusted, essentially conformist students in this land, as well as a host of the apathetic and indifferent. The campuses that have suffered disruption are still a minority, and the number of militant student revolutionaries an even smaller one — perhaps the shadow of a minority. Yet this relatively small group has affected the outlook and "style" of a whole generation. Professor Nathan Glazer, while Professor of Sociology at the University of California at Berkeley, observed: "There is no question as to the increasing alienation of a very substantial part of the students";[5] "A Declaration of Campus Unrest," a statement by a group of thirty university administrators, trustees, and foundation officers, said, "On the

*Numbers in superscript refer to footnotes listed at the end of each chapter.

disturbed campuses and among the majority of orderly students, there are widely shared discontents which extremists are at times able to manipulate to destructive ends";[6] and six Congressmen, reporting to President Nixon on campus unrest, found that student alienation, far from being restricted to a few militants, is widespread and growing.[7] Of the size of the alienated segment of the college student population, a student observer in a perceptive analysis* of today's restive youth writes: "To be alienated is to be dissatisfied with the kind of personality and life experience that this culture permits and expects. With this definition of social alienation, it is clear to members of youth culture that the number of alienated young people is much higher than the estimates behind which adult society hides from the truth."[8]

Who are they, this new breed of college students, the restless, frustrated, and discontented, as well as the activists and militants among them, whose influence upon their generation appears to be so considerable?

The black militants among them, without wishing to destroy the American system or the university, rather seek to make both more responsive to the needs of their race — in the university by the admission of more black students and the employment of more black faculty and by the provision of black housing units and programs of black history and culture. These students come from all classes and in increasing numbers from the ranks of the "disadvantaged."

The white activists distribute themselves at all points along the protest spectrum from the idealist who speaks within the system to achieve reform to the revolutionary extremists, such as the Weathermen, who view every element as corrupt beyond salvation, including the university, regarded as its principal tool. Many of the rebel youth do not fit neatly into any specialized group. According to recent surveys, the disaffected come largely from the upper middle class and possess better than average intelligence and academic records. Their parents, in the main, have better than average incomes and are politically liberal. The activists major in the humanities and social sciences and identify with intellectual and humanitarian goals. According to Kenneth Keniston, Associate Professor of Psychology in the Yale University School of Medicine, psychological studies find them to be rather more integrated, self-accepting, and "advanced" in a psychological sense than their politically inactive contemporaries.[9] In short, they come from comfortable homes and good schools; they have good intelligence, good health, and almost unlimited opportunities for self-development.

*The *Whole World is Watching: A Young Man Looks at Youth's Dissent*, by Mark Gerzon. New York: The Viking Press, 1969.

They are unlikely to come from rural or small town areas, and few are found among those in the lower classes who seek to improve their socio-economic status or among prospective scientists, engineers, doctors, or businessmen. They are more likely to be found in large colleges and universities than in small ones, in colleges with high rather than low academic standards, in those with a reputation for encouraging freedom of expression, and in private and state rather than denominational institutions.

Such generalized description, however, only partially delimits the disruptive student. Without being activists or alienated, thousands fit into the categories from which the majority of the militants derive. There is clearly a protest-prone factor of temperament to distinguish those who man the barricades from those who do not.

The ideology of the rebellion is a confused one, a crazy-quilt of many strands, not always in harmony with each other and lacking a clear, well-defined pattern or center. Yet the fact of its existence in many parts of the world excites an irresistible urge to discover a common meaning in it all, to find some central, unifying, all-encompassing explanation, to be able to say "at bottom" it is this or that. The causes, in reality, are multiple and interrelated. The phenomenon of unrest is far too complex to yield to simple explanations, and there appears to be ample reason to accept the judgment of Dr. Seymour L. Halleck, Professor of Psychiatry at the University of Wisconsin, that "no hypotheses thus far advanced can be considered a sufficient explanation of student unrest. At best each is a partial explanation which sheds only a small light on a highly complex phenomenon," and frequently is exhortative rather than explanatory, little more than a cry, either of outraged indignation at the ignorance, irresponsibility, and intolerable self-righteousness of militant youth or praise for its idealism and courage.[10]

This chapter does not attempt a full-scale portrait of the alienated among the young generation of today. Its limited intent is to show something of the complexity of the current student discontent by setting forth leading hypotheses of its sources, each of which contains a penetrating insight into the problem.

A prominent theory of student militancy is that, in essence, it is no more than the age-old revolt of youth against their elders. The most recent full-length development of this thesis is that of Professor Lewis S. Feuer in *The Conflict of Generations: The Character and Significance of Student Movements.* Students are not really concerned, he says, with having their demands met. They are simply acting out hostility toward their parents. Student uprisings are "symbolic parricide" designed to

attack the authority and power of their fathers and to overthrow their institutions. The young see themselves as "chosen redeemers." The driving energy of these revolts comes, says Feuer, from unconscious sources and is rooted in psychic rather than in social relations.

The extent of "The Generation Gap" today is a matter of opinion. Kenneth Keniston, in *Young Radicals,* asks us to remember that "the basic values of the New Left are neither new nor startling. They are ancient and familiar. The only startling fact is that he (the young radical) takes these values seriously and proposes that American society and the world set about implementing them. Thus, for young men and women like these, who were brought up to believe that prejudice, hatred, and discrimination are wrong, that suffering should be alleviated, that all men should have equal opportunities and an equal say in the decisions affecting their lives, that peace and justice should be sought after, that violence should be minimized, that men should seek to relate to each other in a human, open, direct, and personal way, the values of the New Left are not at all alien."[11]

Yet even if the issues are in no way new, generational response to them may be quite different. The anthropologist Margaret Mead takes the following view:

> All of us who grew up before the war are immigrants in time, immigrants from an earlier world living in an age essentially different from anything we knew before . . . an age for which we are essentially unprepared, and we are trying to make do with outmoded forms . . . . Once the fact of a deep, unprecedented worldwide generation gap is firmly established in the minds of both the young and the old, communication can be established again. But as long as any adult thinks that he, like the parents and teachers of old, can invoke his own youth to understand the youth before him, he is lost.[12]

It is clear that many restive young people today are experiencing a massive discontinuity and break with the past, involving family, church, social institutions, traditional values and allegiances. This cleavage, at its deepest, reflects a rejection by today's radical militants of the legitimacy of the authority of their elders.

The chief reason for the current gap, it is argued, is the revolutionary acceleration of the pace of change. Because of it, the outer world which shapes a youth's inner world — his values and his identity — is not slightly but radically different from the outer world that shaped the outlook of his parents. Among the results of this all-powerful influence upon the young is not only a world view quite different from that of an older generation, but a different set of attitudes toward the future. "If one cannot predict even five years ahead," says Professor Halleck, "he

must alter his psychological perspectives." Lessons from history or the wisdom of the past become less relevant and planning for the future futile. One's value system becomes geared to enjoyment of the present. "Youth are no lazier," he writes, "no more hedonistic or passive than their parents." Rather, conditions do not favor "future-oriented values" such as the material goals which motivated their parents. Likewise, as reverence for property diminishes, youth places more value on human relationships and puts more emphasis on "being than on doing."[13]

Professor Jacques Barzun of Columbia University attributes much of student discontent and frustration to reaction against the straightjacket pressures of the modern, competitive educational system. What is the common situation of being students, he asks?

> The first striking fact is that modern society has turned itself over to education and created, without knowing it, a mandarin system. I mean by this that in order to achieve any goal, however modest, one must qualify. Qualifying means having been trained, passed a course, obtained a certificate. 'Show me your credentials . . . . What was your score on the S.A.T., the X.Y.Z., the F.O.B.?'
>
> The young in college were born into this system, which in this country is not much older than they, and they feel, quite rightly, intense claustrophobia. They have been in this groove since sandbox.[14]

Modern educational objectives and techniques may contribute in even another way to youth's widespread questioning of authority and the goals of the Establishment by virtue of the fact that much of classroom teaching has been directed toward objective, critical examination of our social and political institutions and way of life. "Our schools," as Irving Kristol has written, "no longer transmit values for the most part; they regard it as their job to question values. One can hardly blame the schools, though many are tempted to do so. Why should they, and they alone, be the sustainers of traditional authority?"[15]

In company with other observers, Dr. Bruno Bettelheim, Professor of Psychology at the University of Chicago, attributes much of the unrest of the young to our permissive American childrearing practices. In today's affluent society, he says, satisfactions are immediate. "Youth expects instant solutions — even to problems that have plagued man for generations. . . . Today, many parents are unwilling to face their children's displeasure when they impose controls. And they are also unwilling to invite the child to embark on the troublesome search for alternatives when frustration occurs. . . . As long as this process is not reversed, ours will become a time of more violence still."[16]

A compelling explanation of the discontent and disaffection of students in college and in the late years of high school is frustration and resentment over prolonged entrapment in an artificial, unreal school

environment at a time when they are ready to confront the "real" world and long for its challenge. At an earlier period in our history, the schooling of most young people ended at age fourteen or fifteen, and thereafter they became self-supporting, without adolescent revolt. Forces in contemporary society prolong their dependence and close the door to manhood. The interminable delay of opportunity to assume the rights and responsibilities of adult life is especially galling to today's students, who are older, not in age but in maturity, perhaps by two years, than those of previous generations.[17] In this prolonged dependence imposed on the youth Professor Bettelheim finds "the common denominator of the various new movements of student power and youthful revolution."[18]

In a similar vein, Peter Marin in "The Open Truth and Fiery Vehemence of Youth" eloquently sets forth the rebellion of a young boy against prolonged waiting "to live."

> Schools, rooted as they are in a Victorian century and seemingly suspicious of life itself, are his natural enemies. They don't help, as they might, to make the bridge between his private and social worlds; they insist, instead, on their separation. Indeed, family, community, and school all combine — especially in the suburbs — to isolate and 'protect' him from the adventure, risk, and participation he needs; the same energies that relate him at this crucial point to nature result in a kind of exile from the social environment.

In few other cultures, he says, have persons of fifteen to eighteen years of age been so uselessly isolated from participation in the community, or been deemed by their elders so unnecessary, or so limited by law, "trapped in a prolonged childhood almost unique."[19]

Youth's revolt against the powerful social and economic forces which prolong its dependent adolescence often includes a scornful rejection of the values of "The Establishment," expressed in the American dream of material progress without limit and of the industrial ethic of hard work, thrift, and self-discipline for the sake of "success" in acquiring the goods of this world. "The generation gap is now a moral chasm," says J. Bronowski, "across which the young stare at their elders with distrust, convinced that the values which make for success are fakes."[20]

The young are also sharply hostile to the mechanization and depersonalization of life, to every device to turn human beings into interchangeable numbers on IBM cards, to any loss or diminution of personal identity and human warmth. They hunger for open, intimate, trusting human relationships. And this deep need for close relationships is fulfilled most completely in living with others through shared hardship and danger of the sort provided by violent confrontations or the seizing of a building. After the occupation of Harvard's University Hall, a stu-

dent said, "What was most euphoric, however, was us and what we were to each other. For those few hours we were brothers and sisters. . . . You had to realize, whatever your politics, that . . . we were very human, and we were very together." Such "intoxication with rebellion-forged bonds among a passionate new community" may be a significant ingredient of the student rebellion.[21] In this connection, the insights of the poet Stephen Spender are particularly penetrating. What the students who "liberated" buildings at Columbia and at the Sorbonne were seeking, says Spender, was not so much specific goals as "a state of being," a *permanent* revolution. And he confirms the view of others that the true aims of the student movement are more religious, aesthetic, and moral than political. The young, he says, are upholding an idea of "life" against a society which to them spells death.[22] His analysis is given poignant support in the prayer of a Radcliffe student at the 1968 Commencement: "Let there be born in us a strange joy that will help us to live and to die and to remake the soul of our time."[23]

Indeed, it appears likely that modern technology itself may be a most powerful source of the disquietude of modern man, young and old alike. We sense huge, impersonal forces which stifle individual freedom and growth and generate a widespread feeling of impotence, frustration, insignificance, and inability to influence events or to anticipate the future. With such a weight on the human spirit in mind, a Harvard undergraduate writes, "We live with the horrible feeling of being a pawn caught in someone else's chess game."[24]

Youth's affirmation of things human against the mechanistic inhumanity of much of modern life is reflected in Archibald MacLeish's analysis of the source of the contemporary feeling of frustration as a "numb, unformed, persisting sense . . . that we, as Americans, we perhaps as members of our generation on earth, have somehow lost control of the management of our affairs, of the direction of our lives, of what our ancestors would have called our destiny."[25] He returns to the same theme a year later and asks whether the unsolved problems of American society and the tragic events of the past decade are the root causes of the profound, almost undefinable uneasiness of young and old alike? His answer is "No." "The long diminution, the progressive diminution, of values put upon man, upon the idea of man, in modern society had met the revulsion of a generation of the young who condemned it in all its aspects, left as well as right. . . ." For all its faults, he says, the young generation does possess one virtue "to a degree not equaled by any generation in this century. It believes in man. Its resentment is on behalf of human life."[26]

A strong contributing factor to the unrest of youth today is the potent influence upon them of the mass media of communication. They are the first generation to live their whole lives in the electronic age. As a result of many thousands of hours of television watching, today's young people have vastly greater knowledge and vicarious experience of life than that of any previous generation. This medium involves modern man closely with the world's countries and peoples. As McLuhan observes, "We everywhere resume person-to-person relations on the smallest village scale. It is a relation in depth."[27] This enlarged awareness of the world brought by television is also accompanied by recognition, often sudden, of life's harsh realities as brought vividly to the senses: soldiers dying, cities bombed and burning, people beaten and shot in the streets, the squalor of the ghettos. And this painful emotional experience comes to most young people before they are mature enough to use or deal with it constructively.

The degree to which the Vietnam war has influenced or is itself a fundamental cause of student revolt is a matter of conjecture. One can agree with Professor Richard Hofstadter's judgment that "in the short run the escalation of this evil and misconceived venture in Vietnam has done more than any other thing to inflame our students, to undermine their belief in the legitimacy of our normal political procedures, and to convince them that violence is the order of the day"[28] and still accept the view of many close observers of youth that student discontent can be understood only as a symptom of worldwide *malaise,* the deep roots of which are to be found in a multiplicity of causes extending far beyond the war. As Jacques Barzun has observed: "Any discussion of the students who rebel against the university as it is today can easily wind up as a post-mortem on Western civilization. . . . What, then, is being fought against on our campuses? The answer, apart from the explicit opposition to the war in Vietnam, is: The whole of modern life."[29]

In short, to many there seems little ground for belief that student unrest would end with the termination of the Vietnam war. Vastly deeper than protest against the war and the draft, the revolt of disenchanted youth appears to be directed against the quality of contemporary life. Substantial numbers of the young look with disillusionment and disgust on many aspects of the times in addition to a war which they regard as without moral or legal justification. The list is a lengthy one: racial injustice and indifference to poverty, the assassinations of American men who stood before the world as the nation's best examples of idealism, an endless spiral in the proliferation of new weapons of destruction, the pollution of air and water, the prospect of famine in many parts of the

world, a political system unresponsive to the wishes and needs of the people, a materialism which lacks power to nourish and lift the spirit, the hypocrisies which envelop us from all sides, and the anxiety generated by the ever-present consciousness of the atom bomb, bringing "the continued threat of technological violence more meaningless, absurd, total, and unpremeditated than any imagined before."[30]

Youth's encounter with such issues of the moment is clearly reflected in "The Amherst Declaration," by President Calvin H. Plimpton of Amherst College, directed to President Nixon. "Part of the turmoil in universities," he says, "derives from the distance separating the American dream from the American reality." The turmoil will continue, he concludes, "among those who are dedicated to humane and reasoned changes until you and other political leaders of our country address more effectively, massively, and persistently the major social and foreign problems of our society."[31]

CHAPTER I FOOTNOTES

1. "A Declaration of Campus Unrest," *New York Times,* April 18, 1969, p. 30.
2. George Wald, Address at Kresge Auditorium, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, March 4, 1969.
3. D. W. Brogan, "The Student Revolt," *Encounter,* July 1968, p. 21.
4. Dexter Strong, "This Way to the Egress," *The Independent School Bulletin,* October 1968, p. 5.
5. Nathan Glazer, "Student Power in Berkeley," *Confrontation and Student Rebellion in the University,* edited by Daniel Bell and Irving Kristol (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968), p. 20.
6. "A Declaration of Campus Unrest," *New York Times,* April 18, 1969, p. 30.
7. Evans and Novak Reports, *The Boston Globe,* May 30, 1969.
8. Mark Gerzon, *The Whole World is Watching: A Young Man Looks at Youth's Dissent* (New York: The Viking Press, 1969), p. 241.
9. Kenneth Keniston, "You Don't Have to Grow Up in Scarsdale to Know How Bad Things Really Are," *New York Times Magazine,* April 27, 1969, p. 28.
10. See Seymour L. Halleck, "Hypotheses of Student Unrest," *Phi Delta Kappan,* September, 1968, pp. 2-3.
11. Kenneth Keniston, *Young Radicals, Notes on Committed Youth* (New York: Harcourt Brace and World, 1968), pp. 116-117.
12. Margaret Mead. Address at the American Museum of Natural History, *The New York Times,* March 16, 1969, p. 62.
13. Seymour L. Halleck, "Why They Would Rather Do Their Thing," *This Week Magazine,* March 16, 1969, p. 5.
14. Jacques Barzun, *The American University* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 65.
15. Irving Kristol, "The Old Politics, the New Politics, and the *New,* New Politics," *New York Times Magazine,* November 24, 1968, p. 179.
16. Bruno Bettelheim, "Children Must Learn to Fear," *New York Times Magazine,* April 13, 1969, p. 125 ff.

17. See Huston Smith, "Like it is: The University Today," *The Key Reporter,* Winter 1968-1969.
18. Bruno Bettelheim, "Obsolete Youth," *Encounter,* September 1969, p. 32.
19. Peter Marin, "The Open Truth and Fiery Vehemence of Youth," *The Center Magazine* (Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions), January 1969, pp. 64-66.
20. J. Bronowski, "Protest Past and Present," *The American Scholar,* Autumn 1969, p. 538.
21. See Fred M. Hechinger, *The New York Times,* June 2, 1969, p. 50.
22. See Stephen Spender, "What the Rebellious Students Want," *New York Times Magazine,* March 30, 1969, pp. 57-58.
23. See Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., *Saturday Evening Post,* September 21, 1968, p. 70.
24. See George F. Kennan and Students and Faculty, *Democracy and the Student Left* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1968), Letter by David C. King, p. 28.
25. Archibald MacLeish, "The Great American Frustration," *The Saturday Review of Literature,* July 13, 1968, p. 13.
26. Archibald MacLeish, "The Revolt of the Diminished Man," *The Saturday Review of Literature,* June 7, 1969, pp. 18 and 61.
27. Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964; paperback in 1965), p. 225.
28. Richard Hofstadter, Commencement Address, Columbia University. June 4, 1968.
29. Jacques Barzun, *The American University* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 74.
30. Kenneth Keniston, "Youth, Change, and Violence," *The American Scholar,* Spring 1968, p. 242.
31. "The Amherst Declaration," *The New York Times,* May 4, 1969, p. 14E.

We are truly sensible of the privileges we enjoy, and the respect we owe to our parents and other benefactors . . . . We wish them a noble reward, and hope we may answer their most sanguine expectations, by well improving the instructions bestowed upon us, adorn their future memory, and bless the age in which we live.

From a student "address," 1876[1]

We students are in revolt. We are part of a worldwide rebellion of the young. We want a say. . . . We will not be suppressed.

From a school newspaper, 1969[2]

19/20

CHAPTER II

PERSPECTIVES

WE turn now from the search for the underlying causes of the restlessness of today's dissenting college students to an exploration of the outlook of another segment of the youth population, the students in the nation's independent schools, in particular, member schools of the National Association of Independent Schools. To be noted at once is the small amount of unrest manifested in these schools in comparison with the turmoil in many of the universities, colleges, and high schools of the country.

The frequency of episodes of serious student disruption of the universities is too well known to detail here. High school students in large numbers have also engaged in similar activities. According to a press service employed by Professor Alan F. Westin, Columbia University,* high school students were involved in 239 serious disruptive episodes in the four months of November, December, January, and February of 1968-1969, caused, in order of frequency, by racial conflicts, black demands on the schools, political and anti-war protests, and agitation concerning dress codes, educational policy, and discipline. A national survey of secondary school principals on "The Nature and Extent of Student Activism" reported student protest in 67% of the American city and suburban schools.

Yet large numbers of private schools, especially suburban day schools, report little more outward manifestation of student discontent or disaffection than in the tranquil days of old. Despite the underlying frustrations and tensions of many — to be discussed at a later point in the report — students in these schools rarely engaged in overt protest, demonstration, or confrontation. Few faculties felt the need for "contingency planning" against the next uprising. Disturbances amounted to little more than an occasional boycott (or threat of boycott) of a school appointment, a silent demonstration or march in sympathy with an expelled student, instances of racial tensions, a chapel walk-out, an offensive article in an underground paper, or an arm-band anti-war protest. The private school unrest was less than the university and high school turbulence in respect both to serious dissatisfaction with the educational process and, in particular, to alienation from American society and institutions and social and political protest.

---

*Director for the Center for Research and Education in American Liberties, Columbia University and Teachers College.

Certain obvious differences between the universities, large high schools, and private schools help to explain contrasts in the nature and extent of the student unrest displayed in each. One important dissimilarity that bears directly on student discontent is the vastly greater intimacy of the educational environment of the private school student. The average private school is small, its enrollment averaging perhaps no more than 300, at most. The student-faculty ratio is often no more than ten to one. Also, the school is not usually large enough to have protest-prone students in sufficient numbers to form a group and interact in a common cause. Furthermore, although far from perfect — or even good — in some independent schools, communications are much better than in bureaucratic, impersonal high schools and universities. The relationships between faculty and students are not distant and impersonal ones. Teachers — the large majority of them — enjoy working with young people, know them personally, and are concerned for their welfare. Boarding school students are often invited into faculty homes and are in almost daily contact with their teachers' wives and children.

Likewise, the homogeneity of the backgrounds of the students and faculty of all but a few private schools has made for better communication than in large impersonal institutions, if only on a superficial level.

Furthermore, many of the immediate and even of the underlying causes of demonstrations and confrontations on the campuses of universities and urban high schools are not present on those of American independent schools. Most of the students of these schools remain free from the immediate threat of the draft; no recruiters from Dow Chemical Company or the CIA visit the schools; few have a Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps. For the most part, though their students engage in hospital service or work with the "disadvantaged" in neighboring cities, when near enough, most independent schools are not directly involved in the acute problems of urban centers which press from all sides on many of the great universities and high schools and their idealistic students.

For such reasons, as we pass through this stressful period in the history of American education, some believe that the private school will largely escape painful crises caused by student protest. In retrospect, the observation of an experienced Dean of Students in a large boarding school may be borne out — that there has been no change in the school boy since St. Augustine. It may even be, as some think, that student unrest in American education as a whole is a passing phenomenon that will fade out of sight and almost out of memory, like the forgotten generation and the silent generation.

And yet, even if they rarely express it violently, a substantial number

of private secondary school students rebel against many aspects of their education. An attempt was made to assess the extent of this discontent from inspection of responses from 113 heads of schools, 543 teachers, 835 school students, both boys and girls, and 748 parents, all randomly selected within selected types of schools, to questionnaires prepared by the staff of *A Study of the American Independent School,* in particular to questions asking about the frequency with which students expressed certain "grievances." Responses came in differing numbers from a great variety of schools, including both those with and those without religious affiliations. A great majority of student responses were from eleventh-graders, boys and girls in approximately equal numbers. Tables which organize these data in some detail may be found in the Appendix to this report. We confine ourselves here only to the main generalizations that seem to emerge from them.

The leading complaints thought by some students and some teachers to be "justified" ones are shown in the following table. These percentages represent not the expression of passing gripes but of those which teachers and students sincerely felt were justified and should be corrected by the school.

Grievance	*Student*	*Faculty*
1. Lack of student influence in shaping school rules and policy.	41.7%	23.6%
2. Poor communication between students and faculty (including administration); students not "listened to."	34.0%	32.6%
3. School life too tightly scheduled and regimented, too little time for oneself.	31.6%	34.3%
4. Overly strict regulations of dress codes and hair styles.	31.5%	20.1%
5. Too much pressure for grades.	29.6%	34.8%
6. Boredom.	28.0%	21.5%
7. Lack of relevance of education to the "real world."	22.5%	30.6%
8. Too much emphasis by the school on getting into college rather than on what is learned.	21.2%	13.4%
9. Compulsory attendance at religious services.	17.0%	11.2%

The replies to the items concerning "compulsory attendance at religious services" and "too much emphasis on getting into college rather than on what is learned" present a problem of interpretation. Since only 81% of the responding schools required attendance at religious services, a certain percentage of the students who answered the questionnaire, free from this requirement, had no cause for complaint about it. Likewise, in respect to emphasis on preparation for college at the expense of a broader learning experience, some of the students who recorded their opinions were not pursuing a college preparatory program, and none were twelfth-

graders, the point of greatest concentration on college admission and of anxiety attending it.

The generation gap revealed by the study's questionnaire is apparently greater between parents and children than between teachers and students, as evidenced by the exceedingly low incidence of parents' hearing their children complain about any aspect of their education or, if hearing, of not considering the complaint justified. Either the children do not gripe at home or parents "do not listen." Taken as a group, only 13.5% of the parents said that they heard complaints expressed by their children about lack of influence on school rules and policy and only 9.1% thought this complaint "justified." The parent figures on "the overly strict dress code and hair style" complaint were 12.1% heard frequently and 2.6% "justified."

If the students have complaints about their schools, they also have admiration for their performance in many areas. For example, in respect to achievement of important educational goals the students gave their schools high marks when asked to rate the following:

1. The school's moral or "value" education
2. The school's success in challenging and stimulating them to learn
3. The encouragement the school offers them to become independent and think for themselves
4. The success of the school in giving them an understanding of and exposure to the larger world outside the school
5. The school's success in helping them gain confidence and a sense of their importance as individuals.

On all the above counts, a majority of the group polled judged their school's performance to be "good" or "excellent." The following table gives the percentage of students with such a view.

JUDGED GOOD OR EXCELLENT

	South			*Northeast*		
	R.C.*	NRA*	NAIS*	R.C.*	NRA*	NAIS*
Moral education	69.7	62.0	64.6	65.3	29.7	27.1
Stimulus to learn	74.4	74.8	72.1	69.3	51.0	47.6
Stimulus to independent thinking	74.4	74.8	72.1	69.3	51.0	47.6
Understanding of the larger world	59.5	44.0	38.5	48.7	28.0	26.6
Gain in confidence	69.6	74.5	72.3	63.5	49.3	43.4

* R.C.: Roman Catholic.
NRA: schools with no religious affiliation.
NAIS: member schools of the National Association of Independent Schools.

The range of response from different types of schools to each category of student complaint was considerable. Yet a significant pattern to emerge from the questionnaire replies and reflected in the relative lack of enthu-

siasm of Northeastern NAIS schools on all counts in the above table — a pattern supported by student interviews and school newspapers — is the frequency with which these schools emerge at or near the top of the percentages of students professing to hear frequent student expression of what they consider "justified complaint" with aspects of their education. Schools most consistently low in such percentages are those with a fundamentalist religious orientation.

As in American colleges and universities, the amount of discontent appears to correlate closely with academic aptitude. The most widespread dissatisfaction with their education and learning environment expressed by private secondary school students is apt to be found in schools with the most highly selective admissions policy. The brighter the students, the more critical. A socio-economic factor may also be involved, with disenchanted students more apt to be children of affluent parents than of those of more moderate means.

The difficulty of securing accurate and meaningful interpretation of the student response to the questionnaires is the obvious one of establishing baselines for comparison. It has been impossible in a survey of this scope to gain first-hand familiarity with more than a relatively small number of schools. Yet to know whether the student protest was made against a highly repressive, authoritarian school governance or a permissive one would be of interest. On the other hand, the similarities of response from young people in many different types of schools and in different sections of the country seem more significant than the differences noted. This response, considered broadly, indicates no alarming amount of rebellion on the part of private school students, even of those in NAIS schools. Yet it does reveal that many of them, if only a minority of one out of three, are seriously unhappy with aspects of their education and wish to make — or help to make — substantial reforms.

Such evidence is given powerful support in the testimony of many close observers of the young today who are persuaded that they represent a new breed, large numbers of them tense, frustrated, and on edge. The revolt of these students, they say, takes a form quite different from that of the college undergraduate, but the reality of its existence cannot be doubted. Of the private school boys and girls whom he observed at a two-day student-faculty conference in January 1969, the Associate Director of Harvard's Bureau of Study Counsel has written:

> They expressed a desire for participation in every phase of their schooling . . . . They kept talking about a sense of frustration, not being heard in terms of their interests, a feeling of being trapped . . . . no legitimate alternative, sanctioned by the culture, seemed open to them; only dropping out, turning off, or direct action in revolt.[3]

Many heads of schools without overt trouble say that "they are walking on eggs," "holding their breath," "coping without respite" with one student provocation, incivility, harassment, or "demand" after another. In the opinion of experienced schoolmasters, the new tensions between students and faculty are a far cry from the old, relaxed, good-humored cops and robbers relationship, when the cops did not try too hard to find the robbers at their nefarious activities and the robbers accepted "capture" without bitterness or loss of confidence in authority or in the system. The measure of the difference between "then and now" in boarding schools in the year 1968-1969 is well summed up by a housemaster of a major eastern boarding school in a talk to his House in June 1969:

> This has been the year of really serious questioning; questioning of the school's authority, of its standards, rules, and traditions; students are demanding justification in all areas of school life, and resisting the old take-it-for granted, if-you-say-so-it-must-be-true-Sir line of non-reasoning. For the first time, they are aware of their own power; for the first time, it occurs to them simply to say "No."[4]

It is this serious questioning — and the frustrations which give rise to it — which this report will examine. Before undertaking this task, however, we should make certain observations of a personal nature which may help readers to interpret and assess our findings and conclusions, at points necessarily subjective. The first is an awareness of the uncertain reliability of judgments based on student publications about the extent or depth of student discontent. Student editors sometimes print outrageous, unrepresentative things in uncensored or semi-censored papers. Every experienced teacher and administrator has frequently, in particular years of "sour" student publications, shared the feeling expressed by one headmaster in a letter to his school paper: "It is difficult for me to believe that our school is as sick and discontented as a reading of the paper might lead an uninformed reader to believe."[5] In this respect, readers of this report will be informed ones and also will remember that it deals solely with the questioning, dissenting element of the student populations. It is clear from conversations with students and from a reading of over 100 school papers that this element exists in a host of schools and, in 1968-1969, gave voice, often a highly articulate one, to remarkably similar expressions of unrest.

Three convictions emerge from a study of editorials, letters to the editor, and special features by student writers. One is that the schools probably most in need of reform are not those in which the most expression of discontent exists. As previously noted, the greatest ferment usually appears in the schools with the highest academic standards and the most intelligent and articulate students. It is a necessary part of the

school's vitality. Indeed, the presence of constructive tensions is a measure of its success.

Another conviction, supported by considerable evidence, is that most schools which have experienced "confrontations" or minor "crises" in recent times have emerged from them stronger than before. As a student from a school which opened its differences of opinion to an all-day student-faculty discussion wrote: "The school has come through a year of crisis to a far more healthy atmosphere than ever before."[6]

A third conviction, implicit, perhaps, in the second, is that, far from attempting to suppress student dissatisfaction with their education, faculties and administrations should allow its sincere expression free play. With few exceptions, this dissent is motivated by a high-principled desire to improve the school. The only problem is how to harness the idealism and energy of the young for constructive purposes. In this approach we hold to the view of Cary Potter, President of the National Association of Independent Schools, who writes:

> In their criticism of many weaknesses of society and education, the students have added to the picture both a depth of feeling and a sense of urgency, as well as an impatience with the slowness with which problems are being dealt with. . . . For that we should be grateful. The need is to find better ways than we have found so far to make the best possible use of the energies, enthusiasm, and talents of those who are expressing their concern so forcefully. We are in a time which provides a rare opportunity for independent schools to break new ground in this whole endeavor.[7]

We shall now set forth the most basic of the student "demands"; namely, more share in the decision-making process, and shall consider the schools' responses to these requests. This account will be followed by a chapter outlining in some detail what protesting students appear both to reject in the education they are receiving and actively to seek in the ideal education they wish to create. The remaining sections of the report will include the responses of the institutions to these "reform" proposals and speculation as to their significance for the future direction of independent school secondary education.

CHAPTER II FOOTNOTES

1. Memoirs of O. C. Blackmer. Unpublished.
2. *The Choate News,* January 25, 1969.
3. Kiyo Morimoto, Introduction to *Toward a New Partnership,* by David Mallery. National Association of Independent Schools, April 1969.
4. *The Lawrence,* June 9, 1969. Lawrenceville School.
5. *The Brooks Shield,* December 17, 1968.
6. *The Hill News,* May 23, 1969.
7. Cary Potter. *Report* of the National Association of Independent Schools, May 1969.

"Watch out! Ears have walls."

Graffito

On the occasion of a school meeting after a chapel walk-out:

The ensuing discussion (sometimes debate) in Boone Hall proved to be the most honest and constructive faculty-student dialogue to occur perhaps in the School's history. For once the lines of communication were open for all to use.

A Student Newspaper, 1969[1]

CHAPTER III

STUDENT DESIRE FOR A VOICE IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

IT is natural that the demand of students for a voice in the decisions that affect their lives should be a central one. If students win more say in the determination of school policy, continuous student-initiated change will be greatly facilitated. So goes the theory. Yet, at bottom, this demand for "voice" derives not from simple power-seeking but from an intense longing to be listened to with respect, to be treated as grown up and taken seriously. The deep, pressing psychological need is not to *make* decisions but to contribute to their making, to count for something as a person, to be trusted and given more responsibility for the conduct of one's life. It is part of a much larger desire to establish friendly, open relations with the faculty.

The use of student-faculty committees to promote good communication between the two groups is a matter of long-standing tradition in a few schools in which student participation in setting policy is looked upon not as a student "right"* but as an instrument of teaching and learning. Yet most secondary school students have had little or no direct influence upon the shape of their education. Now, as never before, faculties are wrestling with such hard questions as "What constitutes effective communication, especially between young and old?" "How much voice should students be given?" "What are its proper limits?" "What are the possible benefits to both the students and the school of greater student influence on decisions?" "What are the barriers to good communications?" "How can they be removed, or lowered?" "What mechanisms or channels seem to be most conducive to good communication between young and old in a school?"

Basic to an understanding of the problem is recognition that "student dissent is a disagreement not so much over decisions made, as over the decision-making process itself."[2] The student often seeks dialogue more than victory. He seeks the emotional satisfaction of being listened to and of testing his manhood against opposition in order to discover his true capacities. For him, dialogue is a form of action. That the issue itself is often not of supreme importance is evident in the fact that many

specific issues of conflict on school campuses are of a minor nature, blown up out of all proportion to their merit. In such cases, the student demands are surface ones only. Their deep, underlying cause is a pervasive, smoldering sense of frustration or of other inner turmoil.

This points to the emotional obstacles to good communication deeply imbedded in the human psyche, old and young alike: the human traits of shyness, pride, self-doubt, reluctance to disclose one's real feelings and thoughts for fear of rebuff and ridicule, a fear well expressed in the words of an Exeter student:

> To be open means to accept the possibility of rejection, humiliation, and perhaps worst of all, indifference. For many of us the threat is so great that we build walls around ourselves. . . . It takes a great deal of courage to let yourself be known, to let the defenses fall and to reveal your most stingingly private feelings.[3]

However difficult, to listen, to hear, to understand emotionally appear essential to good communication. If that be true, anxiety-producing situations must be accepted and explored if tensions are to be reduced.

Another barrier to effective communication may lie in important differences in the relationship of student and teacher to their school. Young people attend a school for a few years at most. It exists, in their view, simply to help each one of them individually to develop his capacities in a satisfying way. While possessing pride in the school, only exceptional young people, while they are students, feel acute concern or a sense of collective responsibility for its ongoing reputation as an institution existing in history. Furthermore, sharply conscious of the limited time at their disposal to achieve their goals, they are impatient of any delay.

Many, perhaps most teachers in independent schools, on the other hand, have an emotional commitment to their school as a continuing, permanent enterprise of which they are an integral part. Concern for its reputation is a deep one. Yet this concern for reputation students often see and mock as a shallow desire for a proper, respectable image in a Madison Avenue sense (as it sometimes is), especially when it results in the imposition of constraints upon the young to conform to conventional adult values and tastes in dress, hair style, behavior, and thought, lest the outside world be horrified and shocked.

A further block to satisfactory communication between faculty and students is the teacher's feeling of obligation to support an administrative decision or a faculty vote, regardless of his own judgment of its wisdom. If he disagrees with the vote, he cannot, or feels that he cannot, speak to a student frankly from the heart on a problem which may be

of deep concern to both. How this operates as a block to good communication is seen in the words of a student:

> But there is more to this malaise than a generation gap. The secrecy of all groups in the school, students, faculty, and administration alike, is amazing for an institution that preaches academic freedom and honesty. . . . The Master's Handbook specifically forbids a master to talk about the goings on in the Monday night faculty meetings. One is led to wonder what seditious activity takes place between masters with, God forbid, differing opinions. Could there be a break in faculty solidarity? But no, such a thing is unthinkable.[4]

Two final considerations which have a bearing on effective interchange among members of a school community and the quality of its human relationships should perhaps be mentioned. One is the existence of a clear relationship between a faculty's confidence both in itself and in the administration of a school and the students' sense of well-being. A teacher's trust in the integrity of his colleagues is quickly communicated to students, encouraging a similar response. Particularly crucial is the role of the bright, able young teacher whose power to affect school morale appears to be greater than ever before. Fresh out of college, embodying youth's emerging "life style," and often in sympathy with the aspirations and goals of their students, these young teachers sometimes see their elder colleagues as a monolithic body utterly committed to a way of life that is past; they, the young faculty, in turn, may be viewed as mavericks of anarchistic tendencies, a threat to old and young alike. They can be a source of disruption or, because of their closeness in age to the students, they can serve as a sturdy bridge to understanding between the generations. On them rests an extraordinary responsibility.

The second is the drug problem, which in the private school area, according to responses to the Study's questionnaire, exists chiefly in non-church-related schools (except Episcopal) and in NAIS schools. There appears to be much less student use of drugs in southern schools of every type than in those of the Northeast. Far too complex to tackle here, the problem is noted in this section of the report because of its divisive effect on all human relationships within a school in which numbers of students use marijuana. Since frank talk between student and faculty about pot smoking has been difficult because of its legal status, drug use may now be a school's most basic obstacle to free and healthy communication, not only between student and faculty, but between student and student. The following from a report of a student-faculty committee in a large eastern school clearly shows this aspect of the drug problem:

> Drugs splinter the school, separating students from faculty and students from one another. . . . The drug problem is considered a matter of legal and medical concern, and so it is; yet its strongest dimension may be its divisiveness.[5]

A similar view is reflected in the observation of a student in another major boarding school:

> Far from relaxing tensions and pressures, the pressure of drugs on campus is now leading to hysteria and a state of total crisis. . . . Drug use on campus is threatening to the school and most of the individuals in it, because it has polarized the school into fiercely opposite factions. . . .[6]

There can be little doubt about the urgency of getting the whole subject of marijuana in the school community out in the open where it can be discussed with honesty, candor, and maximum freedom from tension.

These, then, are barriers to effective communication which might be lowered if better understood. But, even if the need for improved communication is clear, we may still ask what benefits to students and to schools may be expected from effective participation of the young in making decisions?

One clear benefit to the student is both insight into the difficulty of making wise decisions and the acquisition of skills necessary to make them. Once upon a time, a young man could strike out on his own, plow his own land, be self-sufficient. Now, more and more frequently, he finds himself a member of a group that makes "corporate" decisions. Yet students have had little experience in how to work with others or of the need for accommodation to the views of others. In short, they are largely ignorant of what is involved in decision-making and can learn only by engaging in the process and watching how adults go about it.

An important benefit to the school is that better decisions often result from student help in making them, because students have special competencies, areas of expertise, and access to knowledge not readily available to the faculty. If the goal of the school is the "optimal use of the differential wisdom" of all members of the community, students will be asked to contribute their share. One clear benefit to the school of a student "voice" in decisions is significant help in their implementation. Students are more apt to act with maturity and responsibility within a system they have helped to create.

Among the areas of special student competence might be insight into what constitutes effective teaching. Though occasionally gulled by a superficial exhibitionist or popularity seeker, students are, in the main, trustworthy analysts of their teachers, to whose personalities and idiosyncratic demands they give as much close attention as they give to their lessons. Students can be penetrating critics of a teacher's lack of knowledge of his subject, or excessive dullness, or perfunctory exams and

papers graded without helpful comment, or lack of concern with students as individuals. Furthermore, because more bound than teachers by the rigidities of school routines, students are more sensitive to the effects on them of the pressure and monotony of the daily schedule. Also, candid student reporting on what impresses, moves, and inspires the young is indispensable to all efforts to nourish in them the growth of integrity, courage, and concern for others.

The response of schools across the country to the student demand for a greater share in making the decisions which affect their lives has been a sympathetic one. Many, if not most, school heads and faculties have recognized the importance of creating a climate in which students, as well as teachers, feel personally involved in the ferment which a good school generates. For example, whereas only a year or so ago, in most schools, the student council was the main and usually the only organized vehicle for students to communicate to the faculty their views on school procedure and policy, schools today are proliferating countless new channels of communication and ways of involving students in making decisions, testing each out pragmatically. What was a comparative rarity in former times, i.e., student representation on faculty committees, or joint student-faculty committees, is commonplace now, both the standing and *ad hoc* varieties, found on scores of campuses, too numerous to mention by name. Increasingly, students sit with faculty on the following committees: discipline, curriculum, instruction, independent studies, athletics, school lectures and entertainment, admissions, and even policy, covering almost every aspect of a school's life except financial management.

Our investigation has also discovered a miscellany of ways other than joint committees to achieve better communication among students, faculty, and even parents. For example, the Westminster Schools in Atlanta, Georgia, in addition to including two students on each of fourteen faculty committees in both the Boys' and the Girls' High Schools, provides for each grade to meet once every four weeks of each semester with its teachers and administrators for open discussion, and for a senior girl and a senior boy to meet one evening each month with the Parents' Council. Students at Choate quizzed the headmaster on "The Individual at Choate" and "The Choate Experience" in a situation modeled on "Meet the Press," with a panel of students, then questions from the floor. And at Deerfield every Sunday night, the headmaster fields questions from the students on school life and policy.

Student government is also being subjected to re-examination. Growing interest of young people in better communication with the

faculty has been accompanied in some schools by disenchantment with the Student Council, seen as an ineffectual toy or "sandbox" type of government, which allows students merely to play at decision-making. This view regards existing bureaucratic processes involving interaction between Council and faculty as too time-consuming, too tedious, and too indirect. Furthermore, say many students, not only is the benefit of the experience limited to a very few, but no one person can truly represent another. The goal, however impractical and romantic, is "participatory democracy," which means the involvement as well as the consent of the governed.

In this spirit the Andover student body voted to abolish its Student Congress and establish in its stead what they chose to call a Student-Faculty Cooperative, governed by an Executive Board of three faculty members, elected by the faculty, and three students, elected by the students. The student members are also the officers of the Cooperative; the role of the faculty Board members is purely advisory. Its meetings are open to all, and it appoints subcommittees to explore specific school problems. Through a series of Community Meetings, the students, faculty, and administration of Germantown Academy worked during 1968-1969 to transform the Student Council into an Academy Council which would continue the Community Meeting idea and become the legislative branch of the government. At the request of the President of the Student Council of the Germantown Friends School, the School Committee (the Governing Board of the School) agreed to have two seniors, elected by the students, to sit with the Committee, on a trial basis. Now all parts of the school family have representation. The Lenox School, New York City, holds student-faculty-administration "Town Meetings" to discuss school management. Verde Valley has a Student-Faculty Community Council which studies problems and proposes solutions for consideration by community meetings. Quaker schools, founded on "precepts of continuing revelation, equality, and the nurturing of dialogue and communication" and therefore long aware of the need of students to be heard, usually include all members of the school community in their Town Meetings.

The recently-formed Choate Senate, composed of elected students and faculty, was supported in the school newspaper with the following reasoning:

> The Student Council feels that this method of joint student-faculty government would promote better student-faculty communication, allowing discussions and in-depth surveys impossible under the present system, by which the Student Council must send envoys to the Faculty as a whole. The Senate would satisfy student demands for a more direct vote and

> voice in their own government, while at the same time assuring adequate administration and faculty checks and balances. . . .

Such a form of government, the article said, might put an end to students' "tossing ideas into a bottomless gulf, without hearing an echo."[7]

In its issue of March 1, 1969, *The Choate News* also reported that the Watkinson Student Council Conference (twenty-two New England schools represented) agreed that a student-faculty Senate is the ideal form of school government.

Another recent device to improve student-faculty relationships is the use of a one- or two-day conference before the opening of school in September for organized discussions of school problems. Sometimes this takes place off-campus, with a selected number of student leaders, as at Walnut Hill, or with both students and faculty, as at Groton, whose headmaster was joined in September 1968 by twelve seniors and eight faculty in a "communication seminar," conducted by an experienced seminar leader. St. Albans, in Washington, D.C., brings selected faculty and students together for weekend conferences in a rural Episcopal center some fifty miles distant in Virginia. There, using the "case history" method, they discuss school problems and learn how to talk together.

An elaborate two-day student-faculty conference was held at Andover before school convened in September 1968, open on a voluntary basis to faculty and returning students. About one-fourth of the "old boys" and half the faculty attended. The conference came about as a result of a student "demand" the spring before that the faculty permit three student representatives to attend faculty meetings on a non-voting basis. The request followed repeated faculty rejections of Student Congress petitions. It was disapproved, and the closing weeks of the spring term were filled with discussion, not only of this request, but of ways to achieve better student-faculty relations in general.

The September conference was moderated by a former Andover student, one who had been a school leader, and who was in 1968 a graduate student in psychology at Yale University. Three two-hour sessions were held the first day, and two two-hour sessions the second. Students met alone with students, as did faculty with faculty. Students and faculty then met together in groups of ten and twelve and also of two or three. One large plenary summary session resulted in frank and direct statement of views by both teachers and students. The Conference ended with a picnic for all in the Dean of Students' backyard—and with a widespread feeling, shared by faculty and students, that significant progress had been made in achieving mutual understanding and respect.

This device of an all-day, uninterrupted concentration on a given

question, or problem, by an entire school community appears to be highly effective. Exeter used it in the spring of 1968 under the title of "Operation May Day." Its origin was a dormitory meeting between four students and four masters to talk about problems of communication. This discussion resulted in the calling of an open meeting of the school, which in turn led to a plan to replace classes on May Day with seminars on "Human Rights Within and Without the School." Students and faculty jointly planned the program. It began with a school meeting, addressed by a student and by a teacher. A film depicting a California ghetto was shown. Then the school broke up into fifty small-group seminars of faculty and students, which lasted two to five hours. Afterwards, separate faculty and student meetings were held to evaluate the experience, believed by both groups to have been eminently worthwhile.

Similar "evaluation days," involving joint faculty-student uninterrupted consideration of critical school issues, took place during 1968-1969 at the Hill School, at the Lenox School in New York City, at Lawrenceville, at Cranbrook, at St. Paul's in Concord, New Hampshire, at St. George's, at Taft, and at Andover.

Since they involved significant proposals for change, a series of "discussion days" at Choate and a second one at Exeter, called "Operation D-Day," both in 1968-1969, will be reported in a later chapter.

Still another way of utilizing special student insights about their education is to encourage student year-end evaluations of it, including adequacy of facilities, curriculum, teaching in general, particular teachers, the handling of discipline, and morale. In some schools, students are asked to examine courses critically to discover specific strengths or weaknesses and the kinds of students who profit most and least from them.

In 1968-1969, the English and the History Departments of the Loomis School asked students to evaluate the content and methods used in various courses and send the evaluations to the teachers and the department chairmen. Concerning the teachers, the questionnaire asked: "Describe his apparent knowledge of his subject. Does he initiate or dominate class discussion? Does he show concern for his students? Does he command respect?" Of the course: "Does it have a specific direction with certain goals?" Of assignments: "Comment on the value of the reading. Length? Difficulty? Busy work?" Of testing: "Time allowed? Fairness? Value to you?" And finally: "How did your interest upon completing the course compare with your interest at its beginning?"

In the spring of 1969, again at Loomis, the Student Council Curriculum Study Group organized an even larger study, canvassing the

views of each student in the school on his courses. Questionnaires were returned to small committees of the Council, which wrote summary reports for the director of studies and the headmaster.

At Wilbraham, students responded to searching questionnaires on courses and teaching in history, science, English, mathematics, and languages. At the Lenox School, New York City, in the fall of 1968 senior students and the faculty had several productive meetings to discuss the work load and the content of courses. "The teachers," reported the Head of the Upper School, "were more readily motivated by listening to the girls than they had been by many administrative proddings."[8] The Delaware County Christian School asks its students to write anonymously in detail about the school's strengths and weaknesses. The President of the student body then organizes the statements for study and discussion by students and faculty.

One of the most firmly established, elaborate programs of student evaluations of a school is that required of graduating seniors of the Park School in Baltimore. Its purpose is both to give the student an opportunity for self-evaluation and to give the school valuable material for its own continuing improvement. The first part of the evaluation consists of a ten-page questionnaire, asking students to give their frank opinions of the school's degree of achievement in four main areas: curriculum, activities, discipline, and the development of values. Among specific questions asked students are the following, of both required and elective courses: "Is the work load of each reasonable? How much of a program of studies should be required? To what degree has the school succeeded or failed in promoting an atmosphere conducive to learning and to helping the individual develop self-discipline and responsibility? To what extent has the school helped the student to gain self-knowledge and a personal philosophy of life?"

The second part of the assignment requests the student to write an essay on some aspect or aspects of the school and his experience with it not covered in Part I.

In sum, and viewed broadly, it is evident that large numbers of independent secondary schools have undertaken productive experimentation with granting their students a greater role in the making of decisions. In the main, students continue to want guidelines and counsel. Most have a sincere desire to contribute significantly to their school's never-ending search for better ways to achieve its purposes, and are genuinely confused and bewildered when told that if they don't like the school's rules and routines they can go elsewhere, a frustrating resolution of the problem. Most, we think, accept the view of student power expressed by an undergraduate from Episcopal High School:

> Idle feet win no races. If Episcopal is to maintain its place as a top Southern prep school, it is necessary that it be under the constant scrutiny of the responsible students as well as that of the administration. It is also necessary that the faculty recognize and respect the genuine concern of the students.[9]

Faculty opinion on the desirable or legitimate extent of student power is considerably less unified than student opinion. Lawrenceville's headmaster in the following statement no doubt accurately summarizes sentiment in many traditional schools:

> There is a major danger that we shall become polarized in our attitudes. On the one hand, some of us are prepared to accept to a large degree the things that the young are telling us and the ways that the young behave. On the other hand, others of us feel strongly that this is the time, if ever, for an affirmation of clearly defined values which we as a faculty should determine unilaterally.[10]

Further to complicate the problem, there is evidence of an even more marked difference of opinion among the various members of a school's community, other than students, as to what response school authorities should make to student activism. On this matter, the "inside" view of heads of school and teachers is at variance with the "outside" view of parents and governing boards as revealed by the answers of these groups to the following item on the Study's questionnaire:

> Do you strongly agree, tend to agree, tend to disagree, or strongly disagree with this statement: "The best way to cope with the growing trend of student militancy is to apply firm discipline"?

The percentages of these four groups in the five types of schools below who indicated their agreement, or tendency toward agreement, with the statement, are as follows:

Catholic		
Head	31.0%	(9)*
Faculty	41.9%	(65)
Parent	81.6%	(155)
Governing Board	67.3%	(35)
Episcopal		
Head	33.4%	(2)
Faculty	37.8%	(14)
Parent	78.7%	(37)
Governing Board	76.0%	(19)
Other Protestant		
Head	40.7%	(11)
Faculty	59.4%	(63)
Parent	85.5%	(154)
Governing Board	81.6%	(71)

*Numbers in brackets represent number of respondents.

Non-religiously Affiliated		
Head	31.1%	(14)
Faculty	45.8%	(100)
Parent	73.4%	(213)
Governing Board	74.2%	(95)
NAIS		
Head	32.2%	(10)
Faculty	44.4%	(104)
Parent	73.0%	(222)
Governing Board	71.8%	(102)

The proper limits of the student role in decision-making are not yet known. They will vary from school to school in accordance with its philosophy and the maturity of its students. In most schools, the extent of the students' ability to profit from participation in decision-making—and the school's capacity to benefit from the exercise—will be discovered "in the doing," through experience. In the meantime, no doubt will exist as to where the final authority lies. Few faculties are willing to surrender responsibility for the education they offer students, nor would parents wish them to. Many, perhaps most at this juncture, it seems fair to conclude, would subscribe to the view expressed by the Exeter Principal to his alumni, June 1969: "We believe that the students must be given every opportunity to shape our decisions, but we reserve the right to *make* the decisions."[11]

CHAPTER III FOOTNOTES

1. *The Mercersburg News,* April 14, 1969.
2. Mrs. Henry Selby, "On Student Dissent," talk to Parents League, January 15, 1969.
3. *The Exonian,* October 19, 1968.
4. *The Choate News,* January 25, 1969.
5. Report of The Exeter Student-Faculty Discussion Day Committee, March 1969.
6. *The Lawrence,* May 12, 1969. Lawrenceville School.
7. *The Choate News,* February 8, 1969.
8. Mrs. Luther Loomis, "Responses to Student Concerns at Lenox," Winter 1969.
9. *The EHS Chronicle,* March 27, 1969. The Episcopal High School.
10. Bruce McClellan, "Report to the Faculty." *The Lawrentian,* Winter 1969. Lawrenceville School.
11. *The Exonian,* June 4, 1969. The Phillips Exeter Academy.

We, today's students . . . refuse to swallow docilely the tradition-bound dogma of parents and teachers . . . . We need diversification, stimulus, and outlets for our awakened desires to create and express opinions . . . . We need to be recognized as aware, concerned individuals who can benefit from their own mistakes . . . . We are hungry for knowledge of today *and want broadened courses, electives, seminars, exposure to more speakers' opinions.*

Student Newspaper, 1969

. . . in youth the tables of childhood dependence begin slowly to turn: no longer is it merely for the old to teach the young the meaning of life, whether individual or collective. It is the young who, by their responses and actions, tell the old whether life as represented by the old and as presented to the young has meaning . . . .

Erick H. Erikson
"Youth: Fidelity and Diversity"[2]

CHAPTER IV

PLUS AND MINUS:
THE DISSENTING VIEW

WITH more freedom and encouragement to speak their minds, today's secondary school students have become increasingly articulate concerning what they like and dislike about their education. That the proposals for change should come disproportionately, even predominantly, from the boarding schools is not surprising. As a day school student from University School, Cleveland, wrote, after visiting Cranbrook on an exchange, "If a student dislikes something at University School, it doesn't really affect him very much, because he leaves every day at four o'clock. School is a different world. At Cranbrook, because the students are stuck there the whole week, they become involved with what goes on."[3] Boarding school boys and girls do their thinking, planning, dreaming, and griping often late into the evening, constantly interacting; and, by reason of almost total immersion in a confining environment, they are highly sensitive to it. Day school students, on the other hand, especially those in urban schools, experience much less sense of shut-in-ness and isolation.

In trying to assess the nature, amount, and intensity of student disaffection in the independent schools of the nation, we remember that, as well as happy students, schools from time immemorial have housed chronic malcontents, unhappy, ill-adjusted ones who hated them. Some of these schools' most creative and distinguished alumni have been—and are—among them. At the other extreme, we must also keep in mind the vast amount of student "apathy" about which the activists complain so vigorously.

Student reactions to their "predicament" and to student protest and reform movements vary enormously. Some of the young refuse to believe that their fellows have any important concerns beyond "sex, drugs, and other escapes." An editorial in the *Hotchkiss Record* says of the "typical" senior: "I do not see him wanting more responsibility, but hardly managing with the responsibility he has. The typical senior does not want equality with the faculty. He wants more girls, more smoke, more movies, more pinball, and more ice cream."[4] Others resent the activists. One St. Paul's schoolboy describes the student critics of his school as "unkempt, wild beasts who, in my opinion, are not the least bit qualified to try to bring about change at this institution."[5] Most are quite reconciled to the futility of confrontations and displays of force. Yet we also hear,

not infrequently, such cries as "our voices must emerge from our comfortable classrooms and lounges. Ours is a generation that is going to speak out, protest, take action."[6]

What are the main complaints of the restive ones? Wherever possible, we shall let them speak in their own words. In tone and temper they are reflections, not of specific circumstances in the specific schools in which their thoughts and feelings were voiced—except for the fact of exciting, constructive tension in all of them—but of the cohesive quality of the subculture of the private school secondary student, especially those in boarding schools of the NAIS variety. Any quotation might have come from any school. In fact, it is as though the speakers all attended the same school.

As previously noted, student protest often concentrates for a period of time on a specific problem. In recent years, required attendance at school religious services has been a favorite target in NAIS boarding schools. But serious student discontent in many independent schools is a pervasive one, by no means limited to one or two issues. In essence, it is of three kinds and springs from three sources. It is a quarrel with the older generation about the central purpose of education. It is a demand for a more "relevant" education—one which is closer to "real life" and to "real" personal needs than the one they get. And, in the boarding schools, it is a sense of confinement amounting almost to claustrophobia, an oppressive feeling of being excessively restricted, watched over, protected, and sheltered. We shall briefly consider each source of student unhappiness.

Near the heart of the intelligent student's unrest and frustration is his growing conviction, not yet fully or clearly articulated, that the goals of education now dominant in many college preparatory schools, whether admitted or not, are far too limited and narrow—that they fail to encompass the acquisition of skills and insights needed for healthy, effective living in the world of today and tomorrow. This student is seriously asking whether the standard academic education of today is worth it.

Of such a boy, a Taft School student writes:

> He begins to wonder just exactly what he is doing in school — not just in Taft — but in any school. . . . If we are undergoing such a vital and exciting process as we are told education is, why are we so bored? School is a game, a game which, by now, we are becoming tired of playing. . . . We are insulated from reality. We seem to have been locked off in a utopian world where everyone is dedicated to our education. We are denied the chance to go out and get our hands dirty. We are rendered impotent by the very system that is charged with preparing us for action in the world.[7]

And a Choate School student puts well the mood of many of the questioning ones among our young:

> The first anniversary of Spring '68's vigil protest against student apathy is approaching, and anyone looking back on that silent circle of concerned people can see a great change in the attitudes and ideas of students at Choate. More and more members of the community have been seriously thinking about their school and have come to question parts of it — not just mandatory chapel and hours, but the very base and foundation of Choate — its goals and ideals. . . . What is the prep school experience preparing us for? Is it preparing us well? Do we want to be prepared, perhaps subtly meaning 'molded'? Do we want to perpetuate society as it exists today and for which we are supposedly being prepared?[8]

The purpose of the old New England academies was preparation for "life," not college. Their goals as a matter of course included the development of ethical and social, as well as intellectual values. The eighteenth century Constitutions of Phillips Academy, Andover, and The Phillips Exeter Academy stated the purpose of the schools to be "Instructing youth . . . in English, Grammar, Writing, Arithmetic, and Sciences wherein they are commonly taught, but more especially to learn them the great end and real business of living . . . . But above all, it is expected that the master's attention to the disposition of the minds and morals of the youth under his charge will exceed every other care; well considering that, though goodness without knowledge (as it respects others) is weak and feeble, yet knowledge without goodness is dangerous, and that both united form the noblest character, and lay the surest foundation of usefulness to mankind."[9]

And almost every school's declared responsibility to a student today is the wholesome, balanced development of his total personality. But modern pressures have caused traditional schools increasingly to subordinate this historic emphasis on *human* excellence to the achievement of *academic* excellence.

Prominent among these pressures are the sharply increased work loads in both public and private schools since Sputnik, advanced placement programs, honors and college level courses which, as the Rector of St. Paul's observes, appear to have "all but outrun student emotional and even chronological development,"[10] and the traumatic experience, for thousands, of the fierce competition for admission to prestige colleges. This pressure falls unequally on the college-bound students of the country. Parental pressure on their children to get good grades and secure college admission varies greatly in schools of different types and in different regions. About 25% of all students polled in the Study questionnaire regarded such parental pressure as "too much" or "far too much."

On this question the figure for Roman Catholic schools of the South was a low of 18.3%; that of NAIS schools of the Northeast a high of 35.7%.

Of this competition at its most severe Dr. Graham B. Blaine, Jr., Chief of Psychiatry to Health Services, Harvard University, has this to say:

> The competition in high schools for entrance to a prestige college, and the importance attached to higher education by parents and business firms, impinge on the secondary school student so strongly that he is often exhausted by the time he arrives at the college which finally chooses him.[11]

That girls as well as boys are subjected to this constant scholastic pressure is evident in this statement by a Dana Hall student, which makes clear the heart of the complaint. It is not that the scholastic demands cannot be met; it is that many students — and among them our best — cannot meet them without serious sacrifice of experiences which develop the entire range of capacities deemed essential for satisfying, effective living. She writes, "Many solutions have been offered: quit clubs, quit half-credit courses, quit volunteer work, quit elected positions, in short, quit being an active, interested member of the community and become an academic sponge, soaking up knowledge night and day."[12]

Thus, the student today clearly questions the validity of an education exclusively, or even overwhelmingly, devoted to training the intellect. Calling attention to important personal needs which his education neglects, he asks to be addressed as a total human being. He further asks that the goals of education again become the historic ones of preparation for life—for him, life in all its complexity as lived in the closing years of the twentieth century. It is in support of such a demand that an Andover student, after paying tribute to the "sound academic education" he has been given, continues: "Disappointingly, the school has done far less in the other areas of a boy's development—despite the fact that Andover is committed to teaching 'the real end and business of living.' "[13]

Similarly, an Exeter student, while voicing praise for his school's success in preparing students "to deal with problems of the intellect," says:

> Exeter quite simply fails to develop a boy emotionally so that he can handle situations outside the realm of academics in a reasonable and mature way. . . . The emphasis on intellectual achievement and the encouragement of a spirit of intense competition are grossly exaggerated, and are in many ways detrimental.[14]

And a Lawrenceville boy summarizes what he sees as the basic failure of traditional schools today: lack of a purpose adequate to the times.

Writing of "the great danger" facing independent boarding schools, he says:

> They're not threatened by long hair or underground newspapers or even marijuana — which are merely symptoms. They're threatened by a failure of purpose, a failure to relate academic learning to a full and useful life. . . . They're threatened by the apparent inability of so many students and faculty members to laugh or to love — and hence to know each other as human beings.[15]

This questioning of the worth of an education overwhelmingly "intellectual" is also presented vividly in an article entitled "Sixth Form Year—So What?" based on a report of a Groton School Committee of four faculty and four Sixth Formers appointed to study the life and future of the school. It states:

> It was the unanimous opinion of the VI Formers that the School has become so involved in maintaining its academic success that it is not meeting the most important needs of its students — personal and social experiences which alone can give substance and life to the intellectual and other activities of school life. . . .
>
> If the VI Formers are then right, we have an increasing number of boys who are lonely, unsure of themselves, confused about their values, or about to give up all values . . . .
>
> By every standard of scientific measurement, the students here, today, are better informed, better trained, and more sophisticated than students here were twenty-five years ago . . . . Yet they recognize, just as the faculty do, consciously or unconsciously, that there is something curiously irrelevant about the escalation of intellectual power which has taken place. It doesn't seem to satisfy other, deeper needs. It seems emotionally deadening. Once you have it, whatever it is, you wonder what you've got.[16]

In addition to a more complete education, today's disenchanted student seeks an education which is not a preparation for anything specific, not for college or for an unknown and unpredictable future, but for satisfaction and pleasure in the here and now. He wants an educational experience that is immediately vital, exciting, meaningful, an end in itself. As the headmistress of the Madeira School puts it: "These aren't children who don't want to work . . . . They aren't children who want to start revolutions . . . . They are saying *today* is important to us —not tomorrow alone . . . . We want to do something that counts."[17]

The generational conflict about the proper goals of education has still another dimension. Students of private secondary schools are beginning to follow the lead of those college students who reject the middle class "success syndrome" and all "élitist" associations and, with them, an education which to them appears designed to serve as a conveyor belt to a prestige college, to a job in the family tradition, and on up the ladder to affluence. A student at St. Paul's School, Concord, New

Hampshire, writes of his resentment over being "made into a proper preppie in an era when that type of person has been generally and justifiably discredited as a pompous fraud"[18]; and a Blake School student, after paying respects to the excellence of his school's academic program, says:

> But one develops the nagging suspicion that Blake is an instrument for certain parents to smooth the way for Son to follow Dad's footsteps into Grandfather's business . . . . The process seems to be: train him for a prestige college, from where Son may safely assume his assigned role in suburban, uptight, materialistic, insecure society . . . . Training is often helpful and necessary, provided the student manipulates his training for a worthwhile goal . . . but what we really need, however, is teaching. Teach us to think, to question ourselves, to learn how to be free to govern our lives, to be motivated to risk scorn for what we believe, to be human to our fellows . . . .[19]

We turn now to the demand of students for "relevance," a plea that their education show a visible relationship between the classroom and the lives they lead outside it. On the one hand, there is no evidence that able independent school students expect or seek from all their studies what Jacques Barzun terms "instant utility," nor that they belittle the value of knowledge of the past, nor that they shrink from intellectual challenge. They acknowledge the potential for excitement and relevance possessed by the traditional academic disciplines. But they still ask that the contemporary scene, "the real world," form a more significant part of their academic programs.

Equally important, many also ask from their education a closer relevance to more personal needs. They show an awakened interest in studies with philosophical and religious dimensions and seek unauthoritarian adult counsel directed toward helping them find a secure sense of personal worth, satisfying personal values, and compelling reasons for existence. These young people hunger for ideological commitment amidst perplexing uncertainties. The words of the President of the Harvard *Crimson,* in an editorial entitled "A Parting Shot," are echoed by many secondary school students:

> The crisis is not just the draft or the war in Vietnam, though that is the most immediate symbol of it for those who 'have it so good.' The crisis is finding a way to live . . . . Do I fight for my country? Do I work for it? Do I ignore it? Do I try to change it? Do I work against it? Do I proceed alone, or share with others, and how many others?[20]

As part of his demand for relevance, the modern student also seeks help in learning to understand himself and others and to develop what have been called "skills of being," "survival skills," and "practical wisdom," now learned, if at all, in a fragmentary way via extracurricular

activities and the give-and-take of daily life. Typical skills sought are those of the art of personal relationships and of decision-making, in groups and alone. To the young, the importance of mastery of such skills looms large. As one student says: "It is my belief that one's own self, actions, environment, plans, problems, hopes, and dreams are as worthy subjects of study as medieval religious thought or the ideal mechanical advantage of a pulley."[21]

Finally, perhaps in the eye of the storm of discontent experienced by those boarding school students who are disaffected, restless, and bored is a sense of being "cabined, cribbed, confined" in an isolated, artificial, restricted environment.

One of their most acutely frustrating restrictions is confinement to an educational environment limited to one sex. There is a widespread, urgent student plea for coeducation, or some form of coordinate education. This plea appears not only in student conversation and student newspapers, but in answer to a question in the *American Independent School Study* questionnaire asking boys and girls in schools with a single sex enrollment, boarding and day schools alike, whether they would prefer the school to change to some form of coeducation. The response was an overwhelming "yes!" Differences of opinion among students from different types of schools and different regions of the country are shown in the following table:

DESIRE TO CHANGE TO SOME FORM OF COEDUCATION

Roman Catholic	
Northeast	88.8%
South	73.6%
Other regions	60.0%
Episcopal	100.0%
Various Other Protestant Schools	52.4%
Schools without Religious Affiliation	
Northeast	93.9%
South	50.0%
Other regions	71.0%
NAIS	
Northeast	93.9%
South	51.2%
Other regions	88.0%

This strong desire on the part of students of single sex schools for coeducation may in part account for the large numbers of boys and girls who, in response to the Study's questionnaire, rated their school's social life as unsatisfactory, while at the same time judging its academic offering to be good or excellent. For example, the percentage of students in NAIS schools of the northeast who failed to find satisfaction in their

school's social life was as high as 59.1%. The comparable percentage for all students polled on this question was 31.6%.

Yet it cannot fairly be said that any one aspect of their educational environment is the chief target of the protest of the restless among the boarding school students. It is the *totality* of the boarding situation in many schools which engenders the sense of confinement and unreality. What can be one of the boarding school's chief assets — the opportunity it offers students for day and night involvement in the life of the school — is, in their view, a liability when their freedom is unduly restricted. In maturity the equivalent of a college freshman or sophomore a generation ago, many of these boarding school boys and girls are impatient with what they regard as their school's excessive number of rules and requirements, far more than at home, where, as one student noted, he is treated as a young adult, although at school like a child: compulsory church and athletics as well as class, compulsory meals and bed-hours, permission to go here and there, constant checking on one's whereabouts, and as one boy put it, "Names of boys on the haircut list read out at the end of school like lepers."[12] To the impatient ones, most of these rules are trivia, the customs and conventions of another age. A Northfield girl writes: "Students are caught in a web of petty rules that govern their social and personal lives to such an extent that it is sublimely ridiculous."[13] A Taft student comments on the faculty's "amused tolerance" of the "silly flailings of these boys who think they could somehow improve upon this venerable institution that they have known for such a short time," and concludes, "We are, perhaps, more than little children tugging at the skirts of the administration. If not, if it is all a little game, then the cynical and the alienated have the truest insight of all."[14]

An Abbot Academy girl writes:

> *In an old house in Paris all covered with vines*
> *Lived twelve little girls in two straight lines*
> *In two straight lines they broke their bread*
> *They brushed their teeth and went to bed.*
>
> It is perhaps unfair to compare Abbot to that old house in Paris, for no one has yet molded us quite into the conformist pattern described above. But what is important is that many who are in charge of your education would be more than happy to keep us in "two straight lines," to supervise our toothbrushing, to regulate our thoughts. We are not "twelve little girls," but rather generally intelligent, thinking people. Most of us recognize a need for some adult help and guidance, but we also respect our own ability to display some judgment, to think, to reason.[15]

And from a Mercersburg Academy boy comes this question:

> Does it not seem ludicrous that those of us who can be called for

> duty in the armed forces and be sent to die in a rice field on the other side of the world are not even allowed to decide whether or not we go to chapel?"

The battle over hair length and dress codes continues unabated "as on a darkling plain where ignorant armies clash by night." Students paradoxically chide the faculty for their preoccupation, sometimes to the point of obsession, with anything as trivial as hair length and dress codes and then reveal their notion of the importance of the issue to them by both the fierce determination with which they hold to the "right" of an individual to control his own personal appearance and the skill of their countrrattacks, such as the following tongue-in-cheek editorial in response to a faculty's rejection of a student plea for freedom in dress and its coordinate ruling that hair must be above the ears, above the collar, and out of the eyes:

> We of the *Pelican* heartily endorse the Faculty's decision on these issues. It is the very image of St. Paul's School which is at stake here. For one hundred and thirteen years the St. Paul's mode of dress has symbolized a most distinguished manner of life and learning. For one hundred and thirteen years the students of St. Paul's School have consistently stood out at Brooks Brothers in New York, at Rogers Peet in Boston, and at Wm. Norris in Philadelphia, not to mention English shops all over the country. To change this golden image would shake the foundations of this institution . . . .
>
> More important to these students is the issue of hair, or rather the length of it. The Faculty, we feel, outdid itself in outlawing long hair. To let adolescents wear long hair is to leave serious doubts in the minds of our visitors as to the virility, masculinity, and fundamental normality of the studentry. These doubts endanger the financial status of this institution, which as we all know is already questionable."

Or the response of an Episcopal High School student to a faculty ruling on sideburns:

> Of the recent liberalizations in school policy, perhaps the most far-reaching and undoubtedly the most popular was the recent bull, *Pro Filamentis Facialis*, popularly known as the Sideburns Bull . . . .
>
> The new ruling stipulates: "That hair which is wont to descend the cheek in the region directly forward of the ear may be worn to a length not surpassing a line, horizontal, which passes through the tragus or frontal sticky-out nub." Further restrictions were levelled against those sideburns which are not oval, or "hang down like pigtails." It is generally felt by those who are unable to grow healthy burns that the addition of this last ruling by the Headmaster was an unrallied-for clandestine attack.
>
> On the whole, however, the reaction to the announcement of the new policy was favorable . . . . The headmaster was swamped by a back-slapping crowd of pleased students; laudatory telegrams and calls were received from alumni from such remote points as Baltimore, Richmond, and Calgary . . ."

If students seek freedom from restrictions that irk them, many if not all also want the greater responsibility on which freedom rests and argue that the capacity to take responsibility can be gained only through the experience of it. As a Lakeside School student says:

> Students should be enabled to live freedom, not merely to be taught about it. They should be permitted to experience it, use it, make mistakes with it, and learn from experience that responsibility is its inseparable concomitant.[29]

The frustration which the myriad of restrictions brings is heightened for many by the boredom resulting from the monotony of rigid daily schedules which call students, by bell or buzzer, to meet the same teacher and the same students at the same time, on the same day, in the same room, week after week, month after month. The problem of the distribution of time, the student's most precious commodity, is a crucial one. He needs larger blocks of uninterrupted time for independent study. He wants more time for friendships, an area of personal need intimately related to the problem of student unrest. The validity of this request is supported by the report of the Exeter Student-Faculty Discussion Day Committee:

> For the most part students and faculty live in an intense atmosphere that not only interferes with relaxation but diminishes trust. Relationships take time to develop and for the person overburdened with scholastic, athletic, and extracurricular demands this time does not exist . . . . Trust cannot grow if people are too busy.[30]

To the student, the management of time is too important to his welfare to be governed largely by the competing demands of rival academic departments. It is probable that, without a new approach to this problem of time, an approach which takes into its purview the total human needs of the student, emotional and psychological as well as intellectual and physical, student discontent and frustration will continue.

As a consequence of a restricting, confining, protected environment, by his senior year — and long before graduation — many a student feels that he has outgrown the mold. Eager to widen his experience, he longs to "bust loose." According to one student, what he was undergoing was "a type of intellectual molting in which the frame becomes too small and is thus cast off."[31]

Examples of such feeling are legion. Of the many, the following from a Kent School student is typical:

> What is to be done about the sheltering hills and valley land and the invisible gates created by a narrow academic environment? . . . . How can the student who has to live in this isolation during four of the most critical years of his adolescent growth be helped? . . . . There are so many rules to guide you and people to help you that all you have to

> do is stick a book in your face and walk. The path has been walled in and family style meals have been provided three times a day along the way. At 9:30 everyone becomes quiet and is guided into his own bed for a good night's sleep. The problem is personal. You must find the confidence in yourself to break the bubble and breathe not necessarily fresh air but real air . . . .[23]

A few students suspect that the education to which they are subjected is outmoded to the point of loss of validity and authenticity. Most disagree with a rejection so total. But many of the ablest, there can be no question, urgently seek a vastly expanded educational environment and one which is not only larger, freer, and less sheltered but more varied, warm, and human than the one they now know.

CHAPTER IV FOOTNOTES

1. *The Sun Dial,* June 1969. The Ethel Walker School.
2. Erik H. Erikson, "Youth: Fidelity and Diversity," *Daedalus,* Winter 1962, p. 24.
3. *University School News,* February 14, 1969.
4. *The Hotchkiss Record,* November 16, 1969.
5. *The Pelican,* December 6, 1968. St. Paul's School, Concord, New Hampshire.
6. *Postscript,* May 10, 1969. The Park School of Baltimore.
7. *The Taft Papyrus,* January 25, 1969.
8. *The Choate News,* April 14, 1969.
9. Phillips Academy Catalogue, 1970, p. 21.
10. Mathew Warren, "Letter to Alumni and Parents," January 22, 1969.
11. Graham B. Blaine, Jr., *Youth and the Hazards of Affluence: The High School and College Years* (Harper & Row, 1966), p. 100.
12. *Dana Hallmanac,* November 1, 1968.
13. *The Phillipian,* March 12, 1969. Phillips Academy, Andover.
14. *The Exonian,* December 14, 1969. The Phillips Exeter Academy.
15. *The Lawrence,* June 2, 1969. Lawrenceville School.
16. C. W. Sheerin, "Sixth Form Year — So What?", *Groton School Quarterly,* Spring 1969.
17. Barbara Keyser, "Speech at Mothers' Day," October 18, 1968.
18. *The Pelican,* November 20, 1968. St. Paul School, Concord, New Hampshire.
19. *Bad Times,* September-October 1968. Blake School.
20. *The Crimson,* February 3, 1969. Harvard University.
21. *The Remarker,* May 30, 1969. St. Mark's School of Texas.
22. *The Brooks Shield,* November 16, 1968.
23. *New Times,* Issue Two, Winter 1969. Northfield School-Mount Hermon School.

24. *The Taft Papyrus,* May 3, 1969.
25. *Cynosure,* December 13, 1968. Abbot Academy.
26. *The Mercersburg News,* April 14, 1969.
27. *The Pelican,* April 9, 1969. St. Paul's School, Concord, New Hampshire.
28. *The EHS Chronicle,* February 20, 1969. Episcopal High School.
29. *Lakeside Tatler,* December 2, 1968.
30. Report of the Exeter Student-Faculty Discussion Day Committee, March 1969.
31. *The Taft Papyrus,* March 12, 1969.
32. *The Kent News,* May 12, 1969.

CHAPTER V

FROM ABSTRACT TO CONCRETE: STUDENT-INITIATED REFORM PROGRAMS

AVAILABLE student time and energy usually limit reform efforts, in a given year, to one or two targets, such as abolition of compulsory religious services, introduction of Independent Studies Programs, more weekend privileges, a new student government constitution, a revision of the hair and dress code. But the varied discontents revealed in the previous chapter found concrete expression in a series of remarkable student proposals aimed at reform of large segments of a school's educational program and the setting in which it is carried out. Those discovered by this investigation emanate from boarding schools in the Northeast. Too specific and detailed to hold interest, perhaps, for most readers, they may provide helpful perspectives for those engaged in understanding and dealing with day-to-day student "demands." They are strikingly similar both in content and in the sincerity of the desire of their authors to help create an education adequate to the times.

Student reform proposals were presented to the Rector of St. Paul's School, Concord, New Hampshire, just before Commencement in June, 1968, via a letter written by members of the Sixth Form and distributed to the entire school community. In intemperate language, the letter attacked what the authors felt to be needless restrictions of school life and the faculty's treatment of students as children. It made a plea for the creation of an atmosphere of "spontaneity, openness, honesty, and joy," warmer personal relations between faculty and students, a more flexible daily schedule, and an expanded curriculum offering more opportunity for independent study.

By the next evening, the Sixth Form withdrew this statement as unfair in tone and temper to the faculty and to themselves and submitted a new statement of their desires, the chief of which are the following:

1. Increased student freedom and responsibilty based on mutual trust and respect between teacher and student
2. Student representatives, with voting power, on faculty committees
3. The establishment of a Student-Faculty Senate
4. Complete freedom of choice with respect to personal appearance
5. A simplification of the grading system, with a Pass-Fail standard for electives

6. More flexible scheduling, a more varied curriculum, and individual teacher, rather than departmental, control of course content and techniques of teaching
7. Voluntary class attendance for the Fifth and Sixth Forms
8. Coeducation
9. More independent work and the option of leaving school for educational purposes
10. Voluntary church and chapel.

The administration's immediate response to this petition was to organize a two-day Faculty-Sixth Form Conference, held after the close of school in June. This was moderated by professors from the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, who, as a result of previous experience at the school, were well known and trusted for their skillful direction of small-group discussions, using the "case history" technique. The result of this highly effective approach was the reconstitution of an existing but inactive faculty study group as a joint Student-Faculty Committee consisting of seven faculty members and six students, three of whom graduated in 1968, and three prospective Sixth Formers. This committee met regularly for five weeks in the summer of 1968, charged with studying the total educational experience of the school. Then, in order to deal effectively with its report, a steering committee was formed, consisting of both faculty and students, and, under it, a series of subcommittees. These were designed, in the words of the Rector, "to get almost everyone in school involved in thinking out the implications of our life together."[1]

The approach of the Deerfield students to educational change at the Academy was less precipitous and explosive but equally serious and sincere. In the early spring of 1969, a self-established group of seniors, working with an experienced and respected member of the faculty, prepared and circulated among the students a "17-Point Petition" for comprehensive changes in school rules, customs, and policy. After receiving the signatures of about three-quarters of the student body, the students presented this petition to the headmaster. Much of the student thinking in it came from a previous Trustee Report and suggestions from graduating seniors of 1968; one of the "17 Points," *i.e.*, the establishment of a "Permanent Student-Faculty Committee," was already in the mind of the headmaster. This committee, consisting of two student-elected seniors, a day-boy representative, two juniors, one sophomore, and one freshman, joined by three faculty members appointed by the headmaster, was then enjoined to get forward with consideration of the petition.

At year end, the substance of the "17 Points" was taken under

review by a "Committee on the Academy," comprising nine seniors appointed by the President of the Class of 1969. The goals of a Deerfield education were defined by this Committee in the Report's opening paragraph as follows:

> A Deerfield education should be worthy of being regarded as an end in itself; it should not be advantageous solely as a stepping stone to a prestige college. To become truly self-justifying, Deerfield today needs changes along the following lines: The individual needs more opportunity and encouragement to engage in activities relevant to his own special interests; students, particularly upperclassmen, should have enough free time to give flexibility to their lives and to teach self-dependency; the education to which all students, regardless of individual interest, are exposed should be adequately pertinent to the contemporary world and student, and should utilize the most modern techniques and accessories; and lastly, the everyday life of a Deerfield boy should be normal and enjoyable enough to encourage character development, responsibility, and a positive attitude toward the school.[3]

The Report then made specific recommendations for change, of which the main ones are these:

1. More time to follow a special interest rather than be restricted to a standard program required of all
2. More time to work with the underprivileged and to engage in political activities, both activities to take place off-campus
3. A senior year spring term Independent Study Program with freedom from classes from two to four weeks
4. More free time for one's personal use provided by increased flexibility in a student's daily schedule and a decrease in "hours a student is forced to spend in non-academic activities which he finds personally unrewarding"
5. Permission to cut class to be decided solely between the teacher and the student and reduction of the requirement of compulsory athletics for juniors and seniors to an hour a day, three days a week
6. Support for faculty-student recommendation of only six required attendances at Sunday chapel per year.

The Exeter student "reform" movement had a similar origin in the action of a self-appointed, loosely-organized group of about fifty students who met, on a Saturday evening in November 1968, to formulate proposals for changes in the school. After an evening of hectic discussion they reconvened for a session the next day. According to *The Exonian,*

> The initial idea of the group was to demand certain changes and to respond to their expected rejection by demonstration and boycotting classes. The primary motive was, then, to exercise the power which the student body has as a group. Some felt strongly enough to risk being expelled from the school in order to express their feelings.[4]

But a more constructive view prevailed and the purpose of the

group, in the words of one of them, addressed to fellow students, became the following:

> Our group formed in the hope of uniting the student body and getting them involved in what is happening at Exeter. . . . We are not revolutionaries out to burn Exeter. We are trying to create a better Exeter, and it can only come through you, the students. We have waited too long for the faculty to do something.[4]

The main proposals formulated by this group for "Change at Exeter" were these:

1. An executive committee shall be instituted consisting of equal numbers of students and faculty with equal power and fulfilling the same role as the present Faculty Executive Committee.
2. There shall be representatives of the student body present at all faculty meetings.
3. The minutes of faculty meetings shall be published and posted in each dormitory.
4. Any faculty member who notices an infraction of school rules may report the incident to only the boy's adviser. The adviser may then wish to consult with the student. The adviser may, at his discretion, report the infraction to the Office of the Dean for faculty motion, in which case disciplinary procedure would be followed as usual.
5. Each instructor shall decide the attendance requirements for the students in his course.
6. Each graduating class shall elect one of its members as a Trustee of the Academy for a term of two years.

These proposals, mimeographed and distributed to students and faculty on the morning of December 3, were offered by the reform group as suggestions for discussion in the afternoon sessions, a "D-Day" comparable to the "May Day" a year before. That afternoon fifty-two joint faculty-student groups met, two faculty and twelve students each. These meetings were followed by a voluntary general school gathering in the Art Gallery. On December 6, the faculty held an open meeting to discuss and review "D-Day," and a student-faculty committee was formed to study and report on the areas of unease within the school that led to it.

That strong student interest in educational change is not limited to, or concentrated in, a few schools only is evident in the comprehensive set of recommendations drawn up by a student spokesman for students from many schools at the end of a two-day conference on "Student Concerns and Institutional Response," sponsored by the National Association of Independent Schools in May 1969. The following are the basic desiderata towards which this student-faculty discussion group thought the independent schools should work:

1. We should strive for more humaneness in our interpersonal relations. We must make time for communication and action during the school day. . . . After working together we feel that the

invisible battle between students and faculty need not exist.

2. There should be a chance for experiences outside the school so that the relevance of school to the community can be realized. . . . Such programs should require long-term development and involvement.
3. Schools must help individuals learn how to relate to others.
4. College Boards would not be a great problem to persons who had learned to relate their academic knowledge to their environment. Learn English by use; by application. . . . There are many opportunities to work outside the classroom on things which can be related to academic-personal development.
5. The goal of education is to prepare the individual to cope with his environment, both academically and emotionally.
6. In regard to classroom participation, students might become more involved if there were a larger selection of courses from which they could choose. Outside the classroom, this problem might be solved by involving the whole school in discussions of school policy, plans, punishments, new ideas, rules, and suggestions involving the school community.
7. It is important for the school to contain many diverse individuals so that different viewpoints and beliefs will be presented to the community.
8. It was felt that the senior year can be irrelevant to college preparation or graduation from the school community. Senior finals seem pointless. . . . The second half of the senior year might be a time for experimentation and freedom which would help teach self-discipline.
9. We felt that there should be less grade pressure in all grades and that a system of Pass, Fail, or Honors, with comments, can be very helpful.
10. Course evaluations by both students and faculty can be used to improve classes.[5]

The most comprehensive set of student proposals for educational change to come to our attention is that developed by seniors at the Choate School. The origin of their proposals is of particular interest as an example of what can happen when serious talk about education takes place on a school campus over an extended period of time. During the winter of 1969, in part in reaction to a National Association of Independent Schools conference of students and faculty, the headmaster suggested that the Student Council seek out interested students and masters to form a steering committee for the purpose of planning "an ideal preparatory school." This committee sent questionnaires to the student body and received, according to *The Choate News,* "a massive response loaded with proposals and suggestions."[6] While a substantial number of students were still "hasseling over haircuts and mealcuts," the Steering Committee decided to make the evaluation project, dubbed "Metanoia '69," meaning growth and change, a long-range examination of education itself.

At the opening of the spring term, a three-day program was evolved, including outside speakers and two films (*If* and *Sometimes I Like Even Me*). After each speaker and film, the whole school met for discussion in groups of fifteen students, two teachers, and a student moderator. Thirty-five girls from Rosemary Hall attended the entire conference. Each week a new speaker on some aspect of education came to Choate.

Then, growing out of the intellectual excitement and stimulus to educational reform provided by Metanoia '69, an elaborate network of student-faculty committees was established to attempt a major self-study.

A further development was the creation, by a self-initiated, wholly unofficial group of Choate seniors, of a far-reaching plan, under the title "Humanistic Education," which they describe simply as "ideas and proposals . . . to suggest directions in which the Choate community should move." They are too detailed to be set forth here in full, but even the following summary will show both the seriousness of the student concern with their education and the remarkable scope of the document, strong evidence, in our view, of the high quality of the education which they wish to improve still further. In basic outlook, mood, and temper this student statement reflects more accurately and completely than any other we have seen the current, "modern" reaction of young people to their education.

It first sets forth the following goals of education:

1. To prepare the student for his future education by providing the opportunity to learn necessary skills and to be exposed to various fields of human thought
2. To encourage the student to develop his own particular talents and interests
3. To provide a curriculum which will best enable the student to grapple with and live in the contemporary and future society
4. To provide a curriculum which not only explores the student's environment but which also accounts for the student himself as a whole human being: his emotions, feelings, and sensitivities, as well as his body, mind and spirit
5. To provide a curriculum and educational experience which help the student determine values, meaning, identity, and purpose in an affluent, technological and changing society
6. To provide as diverse an educational experience as possible in which the student should have the opportunity to involve himself in the outside world
7. To make the student aware of the importance of self-discipline, self-responsibility, individual decision-making, self-motivation, personal commitment, and active participation in order to achieve individual maturity
8. To develop an honest, open, and diverse environment in which human beings are encouraged to relate to each other more naturally and meaningfully
9. To work for more cooperation and a sense of community between

members of the community. To encourage partnership: students working with each other and with faculty — side by side.

These principles are followed by specific suggestions for the direction which the Choate education should take. We have chosen to reproduce, with minor changes in phrasing for the sake of condensation, the most significant.

I. Desirability of student voice and student responsibility.
   A. Student participation in all Departments and presence at some Department meetings.
   B. Academic Departments should determine the necessary skills for sound college preparation and offer courses which develop them as quickly and efficiently as possible. The objective should be to reduce the number of required courses and the amount of time spent on required courses.
   C. More emphasis should be placed on student-directed learning; the seminar approach; problem-solving groups on contemporary problems and issues; students teaching and working with other students (setting up their own seminars, perhaps with a faculty advisor, the idea being that the teacher must not have to be a "master" of the field but only an interested participant in a joint venture); more independent study which is not merely restricted to the "bright" and older students.
   D. More flexibility in the curriculum. Seminars and courses might last one term, two terms, or maybe three terms.

      Teachers should have an opportunity to teach what they want to teach and what students want them to teach. Students should work with faculty in constructing courses: their direction, content, and approach.

   E. Distinctions between "curricular" and "extra-curricular" should be examined. We feel equal emphasis should be given for tutoring, music, work in student government, publications, etc.

   F. There should be a conscious and deliberate effort to bring student feelings, emotions, sensitivities, values, personal concerns, and hang-ups into the curriculum for study.

      1. More psychology courses for more students.
      2. A course and/or seminars which study individual and group dynamics.
      3. Sensitivity training: the extension of our perceptual and communicative abilities.
      4. Courses in human relations and education.
      5. Courses and groups which explore individual and group beliefs and values.

   G. Increased involvement in the outside environment.

      1. Students should become aware of the entire spectrum of outside viewpoints through speakers, seminars, and cultural programs.
      2. Students should be free to participate actively in the society be-

yond the school through tutoring, hospital work, political involvement, and other projects. Extended periods of independent study, work, or other self-directed activity would also be desirable.

H. Student participation with the trustees.

1. Trustees should consult with the students more often on a regular basis.
2. Young alumni should serve on the Board of Trustees.

I. Students should serve in an active and recognizable advisory capacity with the Admissions Committee.

II. The need for self-discipline rather than externally imposed discipline.

The objective of discipline should not be to punish but to have the student understand his inappropriate behavior and be motivated to change it. We wish to eliminate the entire external, arbitrary system of punishment: *i.e.*, hours, suspension, probation, and expulsion. Instead, we advocate that the faculty, Faculty-Student Senate, and Student Council determine together what minimal standards of appropriate behavior should apply to the general community. Each sub-community should handle its own behavioral problem. If a student continues to have a "problem," his case will be reviewed by a joint faculty-student committee, which will recommend whatever action it deems necessary, based on the individual considerations of the case, rather than on precedent and consistency. We reject the facile solution of expulsion and suspension and advocate a search for ways for the student to confront and work out his problems in school. Student-selected advisors should play a vital part in facilitating this process.

III. The need for more meaningful relationships between all members of the community.

We believe that the atmosphere of an educational environment should be conducive to the free, informal, and natural exchange of feelings and ideas among all its members. It should be a community which encourages people to get to know each other on a warm and personal basis.

A. Less formality

1. In a community which encourages the development of individual life styles, each person should be permitted to determine his own personal appearance, as he determines his thoughts, feelings, and values. We disagree with the notion that "proper" dress fosters "proper" thoughts or high morale.
2. Student-faculty relationships: to encourage close personal and working relationships between students and faculty, we urge that the following artificial barriers be no longer compulsory:
   a. The concept of "master."
   b. Titles such as "Sir" and "Mister." (We hope all members of the community will be on a first-name basis.)
   c. Superficial gestures of rising for the faculty in the classrooms, dining hall, and Houses; compulsory handshaking; being excused from the table; asking permission to talk to people.

   Genuine respect cannot be imposed; it must be earned. Genuine and mutual respect between faculty and students is the aim.

B. Less structure

1. Forms. Distinctions between students on the basis of Forms limit the scope of natural relationships which a student may have. We question the merits of continuing on a Form basis.

2. All classes should be open to all students, according to individual merit.
3. All Houses should be open to all students. We reject artificial attempts at either purely horizontal housing or purely vertical housing.

A further example of a comprehensive reform program, twelve pages in length and embodying many of the recommendations contained in the plan of the Choate students, is that drawn up in March 1969 by the entire class of the New Lincoln School's course in "Political and Social Thought." The document is entitled "A Proposal for a *New* New Lincoln."

CHAPTER V FOOTNOTES

1. *The Pelican,* October 24, 1968.
2. Report of the Deerfield Academy Senior Committee, June 1969.
3. *The Exonian,* December 4, 1968. The Phillips Exeter Academy.
4. *Ibid.*
5. Discussion group Report from the May 1969 Conference on "Student Concerns and Institutional Response," sponsored by the National Association of Independent Schools.
6. *The Choate News,* April 14, 1969.

I am not able to determine, in the majority of cases, whether the school has made the response after the event or in anticipation of it. Whereas, on several occasions, the faculty has nearly beaten one another to death in laudatory backslapping because of its great wisdom in initiating ideas beyond our times, the students view these same moves as having finally arrived, after years of prodding from the students.

Lee S. Ainslee, Jr.
Assistant Headmaster of
Episcopal High School[1]

CHAPTER VI

VARIED SCHOOL RESPONSES

COMPREHENSIVE proposals for change, such as those outlined in the last chapter, are not immediately digestible in their entirety! They remain "under consideration." Nevertheless, there is ample evidence that school administrators and faculties are making significant responses to the student concerns noted. The impatient view of the young notwithstanding, there is a stirring in the air, if not yet of gale proportions. The education which many private secondary schools offer today is different in important respects from that offered only a year or two ago.

A systematic, comprehensive survey of the reactions to student concerns on the part of even the 772 schools with NAIS membership has not been possible. This chapter must be limited to indicating typical school responses noted. There are, of course, and can be no exact blueprints for institutional reply to student unrest. A school's response must be constantly adjusted and refined, kept flexible, with the result that it no longer exists in its original form even by the time its description reaches print. Furthermore, such programs are rarely if ever exportable. Each school is unique in its historical development, its traditions, its way of reaching decisions, and its spirit. Each finds its own solutions in its own way.

In the past year or two, the widespread student desire for coeducation, expressed by boys and girls alike, has met a sympathetic response from a substantial number of independent schools, both boarding and day. Some schools have completed mergers with schools enrolling the opposite sex. Others have effected or are in the process of effecting coordinate mergers. Some single sex schools are adding the other sex. Experimental, short-term exchanges of students between boys' and girls' schools are taking place, such as that of St. Paul and Concord Academy in February 1969, and the projected St. Paul's-Dana Hall exchange for the winter term of 1970. Several schools are undertaking full-scale studies to determine the wisdom and feasibility of becoming coeducational, among them Exeter, Lawrenceville, Culver, Colorado Academy, and Gilman. In this whole area, changes are occurring with such rapidity that no listing of them here would serve a practical purpose. NAIS is endeavoring to keep an up-to-date record of these developments and will be happy to respond to inquiries.

In respect to the sensitive issue of the length of boys' hair, there is little evidence of a significant resolution of the student-faculty conflict

which, in many schools, has been so time-consuming, wasteful, emotionally exhausting, and divisive. Faculty rulings on the hair question have ranged from "no-nonsense," authoritarian prohibition of long hair to specification of tolerable length (difficult to measure and enforce), to temporization with the problem in hope that it would go away, to leaving the decision to the headmaster, to unwillingness to impose any restrictions on length or style except neatness and cleanliness (also difficult to judge with reasonable uniformity and consistency).

Evidence from responses to the Study's questionnaire indicates clearly that the conservative position on hair and dress is still the prevailing one among teachers and administrators in private schools (as well as parents) from coast to coast, least so, perhaps, in the NAIS schools of the Northeast. But the student pressure in traditional schools for greater freedom in respect to personal appearance is steady and strong, and there are signs of a creeping willingness, however grudging, on the part of school faculties and administrations to tolerate deviations from conventional norms. Some now accept the view that a "student's appearance is a matter for the individual's decision and that the school will intercede only if something in the dress is so unusual as to interfere with the educational process of others."[2] Some day and boarding schools have relaxed their dress codes, and a few — we call to mind Lakeside School and Horace Mann — have allowed the issue to be decided by student vote.

The student hope for relief from pressure from the depressing monotony of rigid daily schedules has elicited only meager school response. It is easier to set aside blocks of time, even weeks of it, for student independent study projects than to produce workable, flexible daily schedules. Modular scheduling is being explored at many schools, including Sanford School, Mater Misericordiae Academy, and Foxcroft. Loomis plans modular scheduling for 1969-1970, based on 15-minute modules; last spring Rosemary Hall divided the day into fourteen 30-minute modules, allowing some classes to meet less frequently but for an hour and a half at a time.

Schools in increasing numbers are now putting time-consuming athletics on a voluntary basis for a term in the junior and senior years, or are freeing seniors entirely from required sports. Andover has reduced the academic course requirements for seniors. Mt. Hermon's cancellation, every other week, of the last class of any course meeting three or more times a week will eliminate Saturday classes every other week for many. To make time for independent study projects, selected students at Miss Hall's School are excused from all classes on Mondays, and at St. Mark's (Massachusetts), although held responsible for course work, seniors are

released from all commitments (except for major tests) on Mondays and Tuesdays, or equivalent other time, for a term.

Governor Dummer Academy has abandoned athletics on Thursday afternoons to make time for an "activities-humanities program," which includes art, music, and publications, and even study time for those who wish that night to attend the theatre or a concert in Boston. Madeira has instituted a "Never-on-Wednesday Plan," which frees students from classes on that day for special interest, informal talk with teachers, or community service.

Simplified grading systems, designed to reduce the pressure accompanying excessive grade consciousness, as well as to encourage learning for its own sake, are being widely considered. For example, replacing the 0-100 grading scale, St. Paul's has recently introduced a system of High Honors, Honors, High Pass, and Unsatisfactory. Pass-fail electives are being adopted in many schools.

By far the most significant response, however, to basic student requests resides in the imaginative efforts of many schools to increase the scope, variety, and flexibility of their programs, both academic and nonacademic.

The student desire for such enrichment and flexibility has been made abundantly clear. For example, in answer to an item on the Study's questionnaire, seeking student opinion on the adequacy of "the number of different courses their school offers from which to choose a study program," somewhat over half of the 818 responding students replied, "Not enough" or "Not nearly enough." And 72.3 per cent of the 104 student respondents from NAIS schools in the Northeast expressed a wish for a broader curriculum.

In the past year, school after school has increased the range of its academic program by creating new, term-length electives, particularly in English, History, Philosophy, and Religion. Some schools now offer as many as a dozen English courses, or seminars, a term, open to both juniors and seniors in order to increase the number of available options.

Introductory courses are designed more frequently than formerly for the interested nonspecialist rather than, in traditional departmental fashion, as step one leading to step two in the process of producing a doctoral candidate. New courses outside the traditional secondary school disciplines have appeared in profusion, with glamorous titles such as "The History of Bigotry," "Existential Situation Ethics," "From Greensleeves to Sgt. Pepper," "Minority Groups in America: Past and Present," "The Ecology of the Human Spirit," "Anglo-American Law," "The Act of Creation," "Alienation in American Literature," "The

Rebel," "Guilt, Expiation and Redemption," "Mixed Media," "Perception and Expression," "The Anatomy of Protest," "The Tragic Vision," "Civil Rights and Constitutional Law," "The Image of Man in Western Literature," "Man and Society," "Mysticism," "Existentialism and Isolation," "Black Experience in Literature," "American Writers Abroad," "Theatre of the Absurd," "Survival in a Chaotic World."

Serving both to add variety to the intellectual life of the school and to break the monotony of the daily routine, seminars and workshops of the students' own choosing have proliferated in the past year. They have ranged from those held once or twice a week to some lasting several days, or even a solid, uninterrupted week. Among them were the following.

Dana Hall's program, entitled "The Inquiring Mind: Shaping Tomorrow Today," was described in *The Dana Hall Bulletin* as follows:

> For a week in February, from the 14th to the 21st, Dana Hall's usual schedule, both curricular and extra-curricular, was suspended, and there burst forth a spate of activities of spectacular range and overwhelming variety . . . .
>
> Each day at 9 the whole school gathered to listen to a speaker remarkably different in subject, style, age, philosophy, appearance, and approach from every other speaker of the week. Then the audience divided according to the day's pursuits and, singly, in pairs, in groups large and small, went off to a myriad of workshops, trips, discussions, and individual projects, to paint, to photograph or to polish, to sew, to sculpt or to study, to dance or to debate, to find out how to do some of the things there had never been time to do, to explore some of the ideas that needed more attention than had ever been there to give, to turn from pupil to teacher, or from teacher to pupil.[8]

Taft's Senior Week, May 18-29, 1969, opened with a two-day series of joint faculty-student "sensitivity meetings," conducted by eight members of Yale University's Department of Administrative Sciences. Girls from Westover and St. Margaret's attended. The remainder of the week was devoted to seminars and individual projects. Each year the Putney School has a two-day conference on a single topic, involving speakers, seminars, and exhibits — last year's on China. The Northfield School's Senior Week was lengthened to two weeks in 1968-1969 in order to deal with the theme of "Man's Relation to Society" through an Arts and Drama Day and workshops on Black History, Dance, Films, and Human Values.

At North Shore Country Day, Hawken, and Salisbury two- and three-day Arts Festivals, including music, drama, art, and film, were held.

A new range of experience beyond the academic now being incorporated into the programs of some private, as well as public,

schools is that which adapts activities and objectives from the five Outward Bound Schools located in Maine, North Carolina, Minnesota, Colorado, and Washington. These schools offer young people the challenge of a rugged confrontation with nature — sea, mountain, lake, or wilderness — in training for community service such as conservation, fire-fighting, and search and rescue work. The goal of such experience is "growth through stress," including acquisition of important new knowledge of self and others, confidence, and moral strength.

Independent school programs of this type are Andover's Search and Rescue program, an alternative for the three upper classes for one term of athletics; a Searchers Program at St. Mark's School, Dallas, Texas; Horace Mann's Searchers, an eight-week course for seniors with training and testing on the Riverdale campus and weekends in the field; Horace Mann's program for the entire eighth grade, which spends ten days, in small groups, living in the outdoors and studying earth sciences at the school's John Dorr Nature Laboratory, eighty-five acres of woodland in Washington, Connecticut; and the program of the Fenn School, embodying Outward Bound features. After a successful three-week Sierra trip before the opening of school in September by forty-three members of the junior class and seven faculty, the Athenian School has decided to make Outward Bound activities a permanent part of Athenian's eleventh grade curriculum. The Hyde School, of Bath, Maine, now will bring its Outreach Program, modeled on Outward Bound, until this year an elective option instead of athletics, to the entire student body and relate it to academic programs whenever feasible.

Activities of such programs as the above include rock climbing, rope work, rapelling, sea rescue work, wilderness navigation, bridge building, trail clearing, fire fighting, and many others. Some of the programs also require the "solo" experience in which an individual is left alone in a remote spot for three days with only a few matches, a poncho, fish hooks, and no food. The basic approach to learning is problem solving, often involving the cooperative efforts of entire groups. For example, a group at the Hyde School were confronted with the following:

> You and your dory are at 43° 54′ 23″ N 69° 49′ 23.5″ W. Report with your boat and all equipment to 43° 55′ 9″ N 69° 48′ 34.5″ W.

Programs often end with a final expedition which offers a genuine test of strength, endurance, and ingenuity. That of the Fenn School was described by its director this way:

> The boys were taken out to a thickly wooded area, blindfolded, without maps, food, or watches. They were given a compass, a list of tasks and a list of safety instructions. They were then told that they

were the victims of a plane crash in a deserted part of the country where they would have to survive for three days before help came. However, on a certain bearing at a certain distance there was to be a trading post. At the trading post there was food that could be traded for properly completed tasks.

There were some fourteen of these tasks, with different point values. Among them were the following: determine the height of a tree, determine true north without a compass, make a sundial, make a scale relief model of the camp area, make a pair of snowshoes, catch a wild animal alive.[4]

In further response to the student request for an education involving the emotions as well as the intellect, various schools, among them Andover, Exeter, and Taft, have experimented successfully with sensitivity training groups, led by psychologists experienced in such work.

Many schools also have moved to bring their program of studies into closer relationship with problems of the large cities, of the blacks and other racial minorities, and of foreign policy. Cranbrook and Kingswood staged a three-day World Affairs Seminar; Hotchkiss had an Urban Affairs week with presentations from six prominent speakers. The Isidore Newman School held a three-day seminar for seniors called a "Symposium on the Dynamics of the City of New Orleans." Initiated and planned by the students, who also moderated the panels, it presented three panels a day, with thirty-six civic leaders as panelists in Economy, Urban Government, Urban Design, Education, Race and Poverty, Human Conditions, Culture, Recreation, and Crime.

The Pingry School had a "Black Awareness Day" with speakers, panels, and films. To all schools in its area, public and private, the Park School of Baltimore offered a series of seven Saturday morning lectures and discussions on The Black Heritage, including Black Theatre, Slavery, The Development of the Black Power Movement, Black Literature, African Liberation Movements, Black Music, and Black Art. Concord Academy had a full-year program devoted to Black America, with speakers, films, and Duberman's play, *In White America.*

Many schools are either revising their American History courses to introduce more black history or are introducing new courses, such as Fieldston's "The Black Man in America." At Exeter a black student in 1968-1969 conducted a non-credit seminar on black history. With the support of the National Association of Independent Schools, The Choate School has established, under the direction of a black educator, a Resource Center for Afro-American Studies, which will assemble materials, act as a clearing house for the exchange of curricula and methods of teaching blacks, and sponsor workshops on black culture.

A further significant school response to the student desire for a more

varied and flexible program is to adapt it closely to an individual's special interest through programs of independent studies. Experimental and rare enough to be news until quite recently, they are now commonplace, flourishing in one form or another in scores of schools. These programs range from the pioneering one introduced at The Taft School, a program lasting a half year and participated in by eleventh and twelfth graders who are housed together, accorded special freedom, and expected to produce a major, original piece of work, to end-of-May programs, essentially salvage operations, designed principally as diversions for bored and restless seniors marking time between admission to college and Commencement. More and more, Independent Studies Programs are being viewed by schools, not as gimmicky "fillers" in an otherwise wasted spring term, but as educational experiences full of exciting potential.

During the year 1968-1969, two experimental approaches to independent studies were tested more widely than before. One was a trend toward offering students many more options than did the earlier, embryonic programs, thus fitting them more closely to individual interests. This expansion of options may be seen clearly in the Independent Study Program of St. Paul's School, Concord, New Hampshire. For the spring of 1969, St. Paul's offered a Sixth Former five possible tracks or patterns:

1. He might continue with some or all of his present courses, with the option of not taking some or all of his final examinations.
2. He might attend special seminars offered by various departments of the school, or might pursue some form of independent study utilizing the resources of the school and the Concord community.
3. He might investigate on a "nine to five" basis some form of service or career-oriented activity in the Concord area: working in a bank, law office, business, hospital, government agency, etc.
4. He might pursue academic, service or career activities at some distance from the school — in Manchester, Hanover, or Boston, for example, on a commuting basis.
5. He might be absent from school for part or all of the spring term (between April 19 and May 28) in the same way he may be away in the winter term in connection with the Independent Study Program.[5]

Another elaborate program of Independent Study is that of The Park School of Baltimore. In this program, from April 7 through May, except for a few commitments, seniors were freed from regular course requirements to

1. Do independent study
2. Work for one of the community agencies
3. Choose from fourteen seminars developed jointly by seniors, faculty, and administration.

In the spring of 1969, almost a quarter of the senior class of Middlesex School worked on projects away from the school campus. In addition, last year about one-third of the class substituted a half course of their own choosing, either social service or academic, January to June, for a course not needed for college entrance. The Roxbury Latin School Independent Studies Program is unusual both in its timing — January and a large part of February — and in its involvement of the entire school, as well as the senior class. Through readings, discussions, exhibitions, concerts, and other presentations the seniors' projects are made known to the ninth, tenth, and eleventh grades.*

There are interesting variations on programs of independent work essentially of an academic nature. One is that of St. Paul's Academy, St. Paul, Minnesota, in which certain advanced classes are organized on the basis of individual interest, with each student having a conference with the teacher once a week and the class meeting as a whole only about twice a month. One student writes with enthusiasm about this arrangement: "A boy can no longer sit back and let other members of the class do the thinking and then parrot their ideas. . . . He must think for himself, and for many this means the discovery and exercise of new capabilities."[6]

Another variant on the project concept is that in which the whole school, or a senior class, concentrates for a period of time on one theme or topic. Such a concentration involved the whole community of Simon's Rock for the winter term of 1967 in a study of the Vietnam War, in 1968 of The Population Explosion, and in 1969 of The Communication Crisis. For the past several years, the Abington Friends School has focused for a three-week period on one topic with readings, films, discussions, and work experience. In 1966 it was The Status of Women; in 1967 The Reform of Poverty; in 1968 The Family; in 1969 The Mental Health of our Society. At The Brearley School, seniors chose a topic related to a general theme selected for study throughout the school. For 1967-1968 it was "Revolution"; for 1968-1969 "The City." Results were presented in a paper, a demonstration, a performance, or other form approved by the teachers. For 1969-1970 The Shipley School has adopted a school calendar of three terms, the middle of which comprises four weeks in January during which the students will spend their entire time on one elective half-credit course.

---

*Other fully developed Independent Study Programs which have come to our attention are those at Exeter, Choate, Mount Hermon, Horace Mann, Westtown, the George School, Concord Academy, Colorado Academy, the Albuquerque School for Boys, St. Albans, The National Cathedral School for Girls, John Burroughs, Milton Academy, Wilbraham, the Hawken School, and the Athenian School.

The second new direction taken by Independent Study Programs, evident in certain of the illustrations given above, is to permit, often to encourage, off-campus projects. This development is in part a response to vigorous, outspoken student demands for more meaningful engagement with the adult world of work. It is also a deliberate, calculated test of the contention that the most fruitful educational experience is a wedding of thought and action, classroom study and work experience complementing and reinforcing each other.

In some ways, off-campus projects are only an extension of the now almost universal presence in independent schools of voluntary student service programs, such as tutoring disadvantaged children and work in hospitals and ghettos. So widespread is such organized school response today — though almost nonexistent even a few years ago — that this report will not attempt to do more than record the phenomenon. Of perhaps greater import for the future direction of independent schools is the encouragement of off-campus projects, not as an extracurricular activity, but as an integral, accredited part of the school's total program of education. At the Athenian School, for example, students who tutor black children in Oakland, California, have a seminar on campus devoted to sociological understanding of urban conditions and psychological understanding of their role as tutors. Also, students working with emotionally disturbed children and brain-damaged adolescents have a seminar devoted to emotional understanding of these young people. A few Dana Hall girls take a "pass-fail" elective course which trains them for instruction in reading, twice a week, in classrooms of elementary schools in Boston.

Off-campus projects involving substantial periods of time away from school were undertaken in 1968-1969 by the students of countless day schools, for the most part those in urban centers, and a few of the larger boarding schools. Typical projects of the day school students were assignments in the offices of lawyers, journalists, broadcasters, and stockbrokers, or work in hospitals, youth centers, and schools. Some 25 per cent of the seniors of Norwich Free Academy in Norwich, Connecticut, take jobs in the community on a released time basis while still enrolled in school. A few boarding school students left school for a term to engage in such diverse activities as teaching school; helping prepare a report on the Everglades for the U.S. Park Service; working in a Regional Center for Retarded Children, in the office of a United States Senator and in that of a member of the British Parliament, in London, and in social agencies in Washington, D.C.; New York; Camden, New Jersey; and Bridgeport, Connecticut.

Since the spring of 1967, a selected group of Exeter eleventh graders — in 1969 joined by an Andover group — have "interned" in Washington, D.C., in the offices of United States Congressmen, at work during the day and occupied with study and discussion at night. Each spring vacation, a group of Deerfield boys has a similar experience. In the fall of 1965, Andover opened "Schoolboys Abroad" in Spain and was subsequently joined in this venture by Exeter and St. Paul's. The three schools now also jointly operate a similar school in France. Both overseas schools are open, September to June, to eleventh and twelfth graders of the three schools and to qualified students from any other secondary school, private or public. Other boarding schools, among them Lawrenceville, are studying ways to arrange for their students to spend a term away, learning a foreign language, in social service, or in apprentice situations.

While widely distributed among scores of schools, the sum total of these institutional responses is impressive. What such experimentation may mean for the future direction of independent secondary school education is the subject of the next and concluding chapter.

CHAPTER VI FOOTNOTES

1. Letter from Lee S. Ainslee, February 18, 1969.
2. Letter from Charles R. Callanan, Headmaster of The Park School, Baltimore, February 19, 1969.
3. *The Dana Hall Bulletin,* February-March 1969, pp. 2-3.
4. "What's Happening?" Outward Bound, Inc. February 1969, p. 12.
5. "To Alumni and Friends of the School," by Mathew Warren. January 22, 1969.
6. *Now and Then.* St. Paul's Academy, St. Paul, Minnesota. April 25, 1969.

We must rethink our ideas of childhood and schooling. We must dismantle them and start again from scratch. Nothing else will do. Our visions of adolescence and education confine us to habit, rule perception out. We make do at the moment with a set of ideas inherited from the nineteenth century, from an industrial, relatively puritanical, repressive and "localized" culture. . . . Everything has changed. . . . What emerges through these children is post-industrial, relatively unrepressed . . . a new combination of elements, almost a new strain.

From "The Open Truth and Fiery Vehemence of Youths: A Sort of Soliloquy," by Peter Marin[1]

73/74

CHAPTER VII

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

To the contemporary eye, something of the distance which separates generations is revealed in the view taken of his school by one schoolmaster, writing in *The Phillips Bulletin* (Andover) forty years ago. The feeling it expresses was shared by teachers in many schools. It was characteristic of the spirit of the times. He said: "Phillips Academy is in 1929 essentially the same school in method and principle that it was during the closing years of the eighteenth century. Springing from the noblest and loftiest ideas, it has developed a remarkable system which makes it a perfectly functioning educational machine."[2]

This has a strange ring to today's teachers and students, engaged as they are, separately and jointly, in the difficult search for an education adequate to the times. This search is not a new one. Yet the particular ferment with which this report has dealt is a recent phenomenon, for many schools only a year or two old, though pressures on all members of the school community have mounted inexorably for many years. They now take on new shapes. The educational reforms of the last two decades were limited largely to upgrading academic standards, improving textbooks and instruction in traditional subject matter disciplines, and introducing a few promising technological innovations. Now under review is the heart of the matter: the basic goals of education. The current polarization of opinion about these goals is neatly shown by statements prepared by a Middlesex School Student-Faculty Committee as a basis for discussion on the School's Evaluation Day. They represent an ordering of responses to a schoolwide questionnaire, unidentified as to student or teacher source, and in no way were intended to show one position as student and the other as faculty.

1. A re-evaluation of Middlesex School should be based on the following assumptions: that presently there is an abuse of freedom and, therefore, rules should be more strictly enforced; that, in general, the students should show more responsibility toward themselves, the faculty, and the school in order that they may be properly prepared for college and later life.
2. Middlesex School has failed to adjust to the changing society in which it finds itself. An outmoded system of repressive rules, restrictions, and compulsory activities, largely oriented towards goals and value systems of the past, has failed to take into consideration the ideals and experiences which a student today will find relevant to the world he must face.[3]

Neither of these views is the exclusive property of the young or of their elders, and the thoughtful ones of all ages will contribute to the resolution of the conflict. Yet, in this process there is every likelihood that the voice of the responsible young will carry increasing weight and bring a renewed concern for an education which truly involves the whole human being and relates to the world beyond the classroom. The continued strength, indeed the survival of most traditional schools may be at issue. As the President of the National Association of Independent Schools observes:

> If schools are going to respond in major ways to the needs of the times, they are probably going to emerge as quite different institutions from those with which many of their constituents are familiar.[4]

Indeed, there are those who freely predict that schools as we know them will be obsolete by the year 2000, a prophecy supported by the conclusions of many studies that today's schools have less educational impact than do the peer group and the manifold cultural, civic, occupational, and recreational activities of the community. Academic excellence will undoubtedly continue to be given high priority among the objectives of independent schools, but the evidence on which this study rests suggests that even these schools will offer a considerably broader range of experiences than do the present ones as accredited parts of their programs. As noted earlier, alert schools are already gathering experience through internships, individual projects, and community service in ways to diversify the educational opportunities they make available.

In part in response to these desires of the young, bold prototype programs are being built, such as Exeter's Early Diploma Plan, the program proposed by the Four-School Study Committee, and the Dynamy Program, supported by the Leadership School Foundation, designed to offer high school graduates, beginning in 1970-1971 in Worcester, Massachusetts, a work-study experience and involvement in public life.

Beginning in 1969-1970, Exeter will allow students who have accumulated the necessary academic credits and who have demonstrated academic readiness to do college work to graduate either at the end of the eleventh grade or after the first semester of senior year. After graduation, students will have four options: (1) to go directly to college; (2) to spend a year on their own; (3) to enroll in one of Exeter's "splinter" campuses — Schoolboys Abroad, Washington Interns, and others to be established; (4) to stay at Exeter for advanced study. Major courses will consist of semester courses, each distinct. Seniors will be required to take on a graded basis only those courses necessary for a diploma. Projects and ungraded courses may replace classes now

required by the present "four major" demand. The requirement in English will be reduced to seven semesters.

The proposal of The Four-School Study Committee (Andover, Exeter, Hill, Lawrenceville) is for the creation of a school combining the last two years of secondary school and the first two years of college, as does the pioneering Simon's Rock, with emphasis on humanistic general education rather than departmental specialization and use of various terms from its four-term years for off-campus projects combining actual work experience and study.

These directions suggest that, if work experience in the adult world under the watchful eye of a school can be sufficiently "real" to meet the student's needs, internships may become part of the curriculum, the student moving in and out of school to make use of community resources and returning to it with new zest, as well as enlarged understanding. Schemes are in the air for schools to combine in setting up "splinter campuses" in urban areas to give students opportunity for work in industry or in social service projects.

Douglas H. Heath, Professor of Psychology at Haverford College, lays down criteria for such "action-experience projects" which may serve as a guide to schools that wish to incorporate such programs into their own.

> My criteria for such experiences would be these. First, students need to become involved in action-educational projects that demand they function as a whole person, not just as the partial persons so much of our academic work now requires. The project should have the potential of drawing out of them their feelings, social skills, ethical beliefs, caring and devotional needs. Second, they need to be confronted with real problems and needs. . . . Third, students need the opportunity for *sustained* involvement with others in order to become aware of the real complexity of most human problems. Young people need to learn to go beyond the arrogance of glibness, e.g., slogans like "reform the university," "student power," "destroy the system!" whose vacuousness betrays naiveté and inexperience. Fourth, action-educational involvement should be reflectively assimilated into the on-going curriculum work of the school. . . . I want the action program to be integrated and not competitive with the person's more formal academic development. And fifth, the action-educational project should be a corporate one in which students live and work together for some common goal.[5]

Largely by virtue of the increased time spent on independent study projects, formal instruction is being reduced in the senior year. In the interest of flexibility and variety, trimester calendars are being contemplated which would enable a student to do a year's work in two terms by increasing his load, or to take a first term in the summer. Experiments with the yearly schedule may lead to changes in the time when students go to college, now wholly arbitrary, a matter of custom only.

Further school responses to student restiveness and discontent with their schooling remain a matter of speculation. Time off from school, for a term or a year, to change pace, take stock, clear out the cobwebs, and store up energy may become more frequent. A Taft School student expresses the feeling of many as he writes of his desire to "take a year off the scholastic treadmill . . . in an attempt to rediscover an identity that was originally brought to Taft but was lost in the shuffle for academic success."[6] The legitimacy of this student desire to pause at intervals for respite in the relentless climb up the educational ladder from nursery to graduate school is being given increasing recognition by experienced observers of the young such as Kingman Brewster, the President of Yale University, who observes:

> The unbroken prospect of competitively driven conventional academic achievement from age five to twenty-five breaks the motivation of many of the most highly motivated and dulls the intellectual enthusiasm of some of the most intelligent. . . .[7]

There are signs of a growing student awareness that admission to selective colleges depends very little, if at all, on whether the student was prepared at a public or private school. If this awareness continues — and proves to be based on fact — those independent schools whose programs are still directed toward College Board and Advanced Placement examinations and other demands of the colleges — especially many girls' schools — will be faced squarely with the need to rethink what they can rely on for student motivation and to engage in radical questioning of whether they wish to free themselves from the lockstep of college preparation and set their own terminal educational goals for the school years. It is interesting to speculate on the flood of imaginative proposals that might come from young and old alike if suddenly private secondary education were completely freed from the demands of preparation for college and enabled to become an end in itself, and if the task of shaping such an education were seriously undertaken. One important study, neglected at the time of its publication during World War II, points strongly to the ironic possibility that an education so conceived might produce secondary school seniors who in desire to learn, in zest, vigor, and power of attack would have a degree of readiness for college well beyond that of students more conventionally prepared.*

---

* The reference is to The Eight-Year Study which was begun in 1933 and was published in 1942 in a five-volume report entitled *Adventure in American Education*. Dissatisfied with rigid college entrance requirements based on Carnegie units and with rigid specification of the content of college preparatory courses, thirty schools, public and private, persuaded a group of colleges to waive these units and examinations for admission and allow schools to develop their own programs of study.

Students from these schools upon entering college (twenty-five colleges were included in the Study) were matched with others of similar academic aptitude and general background but prepared for college at schools using traditional courses, methods, and credits. The college

The future of the student demand for a share in the decision-making process is not clear. It probably can be expected to continue and could accelerate into a "revolution of rising expectations." On the other hand, it might become more moderate and restrained as students come to recognize that sharing in decision-making and in carrying out decisions is hard, grinding work, involving responsibility of a high order as well as a great deal of time, more than they may be willing or able to give it.

For some teachers, student bad manners and disrespect for authority have rendered teaching no longer endurable. For these, the savor has gone out of the salt. Most, their interest and concern undiminished, face increasingly what John Bergen of the Taft School has called a "continual identity crisis." Is the teacher's job essentially to motivate, to awaken curiosity and a desire to learn? Is it to be a counselor and friend? Is it to impose intellectual discipline or be a moral example in appearance and conduct, perhaps drawn from another age from the one in which the student lives?[8] The evidence on which this report rests suggests the likelihood of some shift in the balance of a teacher's duties, with a reduction of emphasis on imparting knowledge and an increase of emphasis on stimulating young people to desire to learn, or removing or reducing emotional and other obstacles to learning, and in directing independent projects. "What these students are asking for," says Kiyo Morimoto, Associate Director of Harvard's Bureau of Study Counsel, "is someone to help them bridge the gap between the head and the heart, where the whole person begins to become involved."[9] If he is right, more and more in demand will be the teacher-counselor, possessing appropriate training in each field.

The possibility, even likelihood, of such a shift in emphasis toward more independent work is supported by responses from headmasters, faculties, and students of NAIS schools to a question on the predominant teaching method employed in their school asked on the Study's questionnaire, cited earlier. The question was the following:

Identify your school's teaching methods, *in practice,* on the following scale. The left end represents schools that employ predominantly the lecture-recitation method and a clearly specified curriculum. The right end represents schools wherein the

---

careers of these pairs, 1,475 in all, in many areas of activity were then subjected to intensive examination. A College Follow-up Staff found students from the Thirty Schools as college students slightly ahead of the control group in grade average and academic honors, with the graduates of the most experimental among the Thirty Schools strikingly more successful than their matchees.

A distinguished committee of the Association of American Colleges, reviewing the findings of the evaluation staff, reported in part: "It looks as if the stimulus and the initiative which the less conventional approach to secondary school education affords sends on to college better human material than we have obtained before."

An enlightening review of this Eight-Year Study, by Edward Yeomans, appeared in *The Independent School Bulletin,* February 1967.

teacher is primarily a guide and resource for students who pursue and choose their work to a large extent independently.

Lecture-recitation, specified curriculum	1	2	3	4	5	6	Teacher as resource and guide for students working independently

Using the same scale, indicate the teaching methods you think *should* be practiced.

1 2 3 4 5 6

The percentages shown in the Table below represent an addition of 1 and 2 at the far left of the scale and of 5 and 6 at the far right. The figures above the percentages are the number of respondents in each category.

TEACHING METHOD SCALE
NAIS SCHOOLS

	Headmaster		*Faculty*		*Students*	
	What is	*What should be*	*What is*	*What should be*	*What is*	*What should be*
Lecture-recitation; specified curriculum 1 plus 2	22 51.2%	4 9.3%	143 59.0%	29 12.0%	126 37.7%	25 7.3%
Teacher as resource and guide for students working independently 5 plus 6	7 16.2%	31 72.0%	35 14.4%	84 34.8%	108 32.3%	218 64.4%

The role of the headmaster, rapidly changing in the past few years, may be expected to change even more. Added to the accelerating tempo and complexity of his life is the new obligation to spend innumerable hours "communicating." What does it replace? The head of a large eastern boarding school has said that he now spends three times as many hours a week "listening" to students as he used to. Many heads and faculties confess to being made "bone-weary" in the process. It is probable that headmasters will need added administrative help. Staffing problems, especially of small, isolated boarding schools, may be increased by the unwillingness of today's young applicants for teaching positions to remove themselves any great distance from the urban centers.

The accelerating rate of change may make advisable the creation of permanent revolving committees, such as The Taft School's CAT (a joint student-faculty Committee on Change at Taft) to perform an ongoing, responsible, critical, perhaps prophetic function.

In respect to problems of student discipline, it appears possible that private schools and colleges may soon be brought to requirements very similar to those placed by the courts on public institutions in their re-

lations with their students. If such a development occurs, private schools will be forced to become better informed than many now are concerning the legal rights of students and what procedures are necessary in cases of serious student discipline to meet the requirements of due process.*

Black students present a special problem and a special opportunity. The number of NAIS schools with black students has increased from 462 in 1966-1967 to 567 in 1969-1970, with the number of black students more than doubling, rising in this period from 3,720 to 7,572. In 1969-1970, fifteen schools have between 50 and 100 blacks; seventy-six have between 20 and 50. The admission in increasing numbers of students who are potentially able but, because of circumstances beyond their control, often academically unqualified and unable to finance their education, presents a challenge of the highest order to the imaginations of framers of programs of study, directors of summer sessions for the disadvantaged, tutors and study counselors, designers of diploma requirements, and governing boards responsible for raising scholarship funds in unprecedented amounts.

Blacks in boarding schools share the discontent of the whites with their isolation and confinement, but express it less vociferously by reason of preoccupation with their blackness in a predominantly white society. Through their desire to show pride in their race, to resist being turned into a middle class white, to bring black culture to a white society, and to jolt it into coping with reality, they have made their presence felt out of all proportion to their numbers, and their influence is growing as regional conferences of local Afro-American societies bring unity and strength. As the number of black students in the white schools increases, and if the militancy of the blacks does not abate, we can expect the abrasive challenge of Black Power to continue, perhaps to grow. There remains a question of whether what the white schools have to offer will satisfy the blacks.

This concludes our attempt to assemble and order evidence of the nature, extent, and possible causes of current student unrest in a sample of the nation's independent secondary schools. Interpretation of its meaning must be left to individual judgment. We close with this observation. Viewed from our safe vantage point, free from the overwhelming responsibility which makes pressure so onerous and in no way "bearing the burden in the heat of the sun," we judge the unrest in the independent secondary school, wherever it has appeared, almost without excep-

---

* In these matters schools may find the following pamphlets helpful: *The Developing Law in the Academic Community on Matters Involving Students and Teachers,* by Edward Dauber, National Association of Independent Schools, September, 1969; and *Academic Freedom in the Secondary Schools,* American Civil Liberties Union, 1968.

tion, to have brought constructive results. As a result of the ferment, many schools look to us stronger and more alive than ever before. The response of those on the firing line is more guarded, but still mainly optimistic. That of the Headmaster of Choate School is perhaps characteristic: "It would be reasonable," he writes, "to say that the combination of true idealism and concern together with brashness and willingness to step in where angels used to fear to tread has brought useful returns."[10]

Finally, it is a pleasure to be able to record the report of many schools, for the fall of 1969, of an increased sense of community and trust and, in the student body, of a heightened sense of responsibility. In the past year, students and faculty learned much from each other about the art of working together as partners in a common enterprise.

CHAPTER VII FOOTNOTES

1. Peter Marin, "The Open Truth and Fiery Vehemence of Youth: A Sort of Soliloquy," *The Center Magazine,* January 1969.
2. *The Phillipian,* March 12, 1969. Phillips Academy, Andover.
3. "Committee Findings" prepared for the Middlesex School "Evaluation Day," Spring 1969.
4. Cary Potter, "Student Concerns and Institutional Response," Report of the National Association of Independent Schools, May 1969.
5. Douglas H. Heath, "Why a Friends School," Pendle Hill Pamphlets 164, p. 43.
6. *The Taft Papyrus,* May 3, 1969.
7. Kingman Brewster as quoted in *Youth and the Hazards of Affluence: The High School and College Years,* by Graham B. Blaine, Jr., p. 35.
8. From a letter by John Bergen, Instructor in English at The Taft School, to David Mallery, Director of Studies, The National Association of Independent Schools, February 28, 1969.
9. Kiyo Morimoto, Introduction to "Toward a New Partnership," by David Mallery, Director of Studies, The National Association of Independent Schools.
10. From a letter from Seymour St. John, Headmaster of the Choate School, June 12, 1969.

APPENDIX

THE tables that follow organize responses to questionnaires designed for *A Study of the American Independent School.* Their purpose is to show the frequency of certain typical complaints of nonpublic secondary school students about their education, as judged by the students themselves, their headmasters, their teachers, and their parents. The following types of schools and three national organizations of nonpublic schools are represented:

1. Roman Catholic parochial, diocesan, or order schools, grouped by geographical regions — Northeast, South to the Mississippi, and "Other"
2. Lutheran
3. Seventh-day Adventist
4. Jewish
5. Episcopal
6. Christian Reformed
7. Other church-related schools such as Baptist, Methodist, Friends, and a scattering of others
8. Schools without religious affiliation grouped by geographical regions, North, South, and "Other."

The three organizations of schools reported on are the following:

The National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) is an association of 772 elementary and secondary schools and 42 member associations organized to assist its member schools to serve their students with maximum effectiveness. Its membership includes many schools without religious affiliation as well as Episcopal, Friends, and certain other church-related schools.

The National Union of Christian Schools (NUCS) is a union of 286 schools which grew out of the Christian Reform movement. Its purpose is to promote a Christian education based on the Reformed Faith. In these tables NUCS includes Christian Reformed schools and certain nondenominational Protestant schools.

The National Association of Christian Schools (NACS), with a membership of 260 schools, is a nonsectarian affiliate of the National Association of Evangelicals, organized in 1947 to serve the total Christian school movement at the elementary and secondary level. NACS includes schools of more than 20 denominations, the main ones being Baptist, Presbyterian, Mennonite, Free Methodist, and Assembly of God.

The percentages recorded for these three associations of schools represent responses of the same students recorded elsewhere in the tables. The purpose of this grouping was to see to what extent the attitudes of students of schools with similar aims and commitments were alike or different.

The tables represent responses from the headmasters and randomly selected teachers, students, and parents of 115 schools.

The symbols used to designate the various types of schools and the number of responses are as follows:

Symbol	*Number of Responses*			
	Headmaster	*Faculty*	*Student*	*Parent*
RC (Roman Catholic)				
Northeast	9	58	75	64
South	10	49	80	71
Other	10	54	71	64
Lutheran	5	21	39	33
SDA (Seventh-day Adventist)	6	11	17	21
Jewish	3	7	16	15
Episcopal	6	37	54	50
CR (Christian Reformed)	2	17	24	25
Other Church-related (Baptist, Methodist, Friends, and a scattering of others)	14	60	120	106
NRA (Non-religiously affiliated)				
Northeast	19	89	145	124
South	15	67	104	89
Other	14	73	90	86
TOTALS	113	543	835	748
NAIS (National Association of Independent Schools)				
Northeast	19	90	145	133
South	10	65	84	76
Other	17	91	117	105
NUCS (National Union of Christian Schools)	3	22	26	29
NACS (National Association of Christian Schools)	4	13	34	31
TOTALS	53	281	406	374

The great majority of the student responses were from eleventh graders, 88.4% in schools with membership in one of the three associations included in the tables, 83.2% in the other schools' students.

Responses by sexes are boys 50.2%, girls 49.8%; in the association totals, boys 54.0%, girls 47.0%. Of the 835 students whose answers are tabulated, 67.3% attended schools which are entirely or predominantly day schools.

The basic question on student grievances which was answered by students, teachers, and parents was the following:

23. Some people believe that today's students appear more inclined than earlier generations to express dissatisfaction with aspects of their school. To your knowledge, how frequently are the "grievances" listed below voiced by your classmates?

	Very frequently	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely or never
A. Lack of student voice or influence in shaping school rules and policy	1	2	3	4
B. Poor communication between students and faculty (including administration); students not "listened to"	1	2	3	4
C. Lack of relevance of education to "the real world"	1	2	3	4
D. Overly strict regulations of dress codes and hair styles	1	2	3	4
E. School life too tightly scheduled and regimented, too little time for oneself	1	2	3	4
F. Compulsory attendance at religious services	1	2	3	4
G. Compulsory athletics	1	2	3	4
H. Boredom	1	2	3	4
I. Too much pressure for grades	1	2	3	4
J. Being bullied or harassed by other students	1	2	3	4
K. Unfair grading practices	1	2	3	4
L. Too much emphasis by the school on getting into college rather than on what is learned	1	2	3	4
M. Other grievances frequently voiced: (state briefly)				

24. Circle the letter corresponding to *each* grievance above that you think is justified and should be corrected by the school.

A B C D E F G H I J K L M

The Tables at the end of this section represent frequency of responses to "grievances" A, B, C, D, E, F, and H. The omission of tables on "grievances" G, I, J, K, and L listed in the question indicates the negligible concern of students with the complaint in question. Also, no "grievances" worthy of mention were added under item M.

A similar question was asked of heads of schools. The topics on which their opinions were sought were the same, with slight variations in wording, as those appearing on the Student, Faculty, and Parent Questionnaires. But instead of seeking information about the frequency of hearing expression of a "grievance," the question asked heads of schools for their opinion concerning student "interest" in the problem. It was phrased as follows:

31. There appears to be greater student interest today than formerly in having a voice in shaping the kind and quality of education they are receiving. We are interested in gathering some facts about this. How much student interest is there in your school in achieving any of the following ends listed below? Please choose from among the following alternatives:

1) Strong interest
2) Considerable interest but not first priority
3) Some interest
4) Negligible interest

	Strong interest	Considerable interest	Some interest	Negligible interest
A larger share of influence in shaping school rules and policy	1	2	3	4
Improved communication (or relations) with faculty and administration	1	2	3	4
A course of study more relevant to the concerns of the "real world"	1	2	3	4
More elective opportunity	1	2	3	4
More interesting and vital teaching	1	2	3	4
More personal freedom in choice of dress and hair styles	1	2	3	4
A less regimented, crowded daily schedule (i.e., more time for oneself)	1	2	3	4
Abolition of compulsory attendance at religious services	1	2	3	4
Other student "demands" frequently voiced: (briefly describe)	1	2	3	4

Because of this difference in the wording of the question, the consistently higher percentages of headmaster responses reflecting "strong or considerable student interest" must be interpreted with caution. It may be easier for a head of a school to acknowledge strong student interest in a problem than to acknowledge student "grievance." On the other hand, the high incidence of the "strong and considerable interest" response may mean that heads of schools, responsible for the well-being and happiness of the entire school family and for the reputation of their school, are more sensitive than other members of the community to expression of student concerns, however phrased. Or perhaps heads of schools exerted a greater effort than others to elicit expression of student opinion.

In any event, for purposes of comparison in the following Tables, "strong and considerable student interest" in achieving the specified goals is equated with "grievance" heard expressed "frequently or very frequently." The percentage figures at the left of each column in the Tables combine the responses "frequent" and "very frequent" with respect to hearing students express the grievance in question. The numbers on the right side represent in each category the actual number of responses recorded. For the total number of respondents, see page 84. The word "justified" in the columns containing it represents the percentage of respondents in each category who said that they regarded the student grievance in question as a justified one which should be corrected by the school.

TABLE A

LACK OF STUDENT INFLUENCE IN SHAPING SCHOOL RULES AND POLICY

	Head of School		*Faculty*		*Faculty Believe Justified*		*Students*		*Students Believe Justified*		*Parents*		*Parents Believe Justified*	
RC Northeast	66.6	6	31.6	18	17.2	10	42.7	32	30.7	23	15.9	10	9.4	6
RC South	90.0	9	40.8	20	16.3	8	45.0	36	36.2	29	15.9	11	8.5	6
RC Other	70.0	7	42.6	23	29.6	16	49.3	35	45.1	32	1.6	1	9.4	6
Lutheran	60.0	3	48.1	12	28.6	6	58.9	23	53.8	21	21.2	7	12.1	4
Seventh-day Adventist	16.7	1	18.2	2	36.4	4	43.7	7	35.3	6	5.1	1	0.0	0
Jewish	33.3	1	14.3	1	14.3	1	37.4	6	31.2	5	20.0	3	20.0	3
Episcopal	50.0	3	51.3	19	24.3	9	59.2	32	40.7	22	14.3	7	8.0	4
Christian Reformed	100.0	2	35.3	6	23.5	4	62.5	15	54.2	13	4.0	1	0.0	0
Other Church	42.9	6	50.0	30	31.7	19	50.8	61	47.5	57	11.4	12	8.5	9
Non-religiously affil. Northeast	63.1	12	55.1	49	24.7	22	63.2	91	48.3	70	18.9	23	12.1	15
Non-religiously affil. South	20.0	3	49.2	33	22.4	15	49.5	51	36.5	38	14.6	13	7.9	7
Non-religiously affil. Other	69.3	9	47.2	33	19.2	14	56.3	49	35.6	32	13.2	11	9.3	8
NAIS Northeast	73.6	14	58.9	53	26.7	90	68.7	99	48.3	70	21.2	28	12.8	17
NAIS South	40.0	4	49.3	32	18.5	65	50.0	42	36.9	31	14.4	11	6.6	5
NAIS Other	68.7	11	45.5	40	17.6	91	56.2	64	40.2	47	14.3	15	11.4	12
NUCS	66.6	2	27.2	6	27.3	22	65.4	17	53.8	14	3.4	1	0.0	0
NACS	25.0	1	23.1	3	15.4	13	35.3	12	38.2	13	0.0	0	3.2	1

TABLE B

POOR COMMUNICATION BETWEEN STUDENTS AND FACULTY

	Head of School		*Faculty*		*Faculty Believe Justified*		*Students*		*Students Believe Justified*		*Parents*		*Parents Believe Justified*	
RC Northeast	77.7	7	28.1	16	39.7	23	36.0	27	36.6	27	17.7	11	26.6	17
RC South	90.0	9	49.0	24	40.8	20	45.0	36	33.7	27	13.0	9	21.1	15
RC Other	70.0	7	30.2	16	37.0	20	45.1	32	43.7	31	1.6	1	15.6	10
Lutheran	60.0	3	38.1	8	28.6	6	51.3	20	43.6	17	9.1	3	0.0	0
Seventh-day Adventist	33.3	2	18.2	2	36.4	4	43.7	7	5.9	1	0.0	0	9.5	2
Jewish	33.3	1	28.6	2	28.6	2	43.7	7	50.0	8	40.0	6	40.0	6
Episcopal	50.0	3	43.2	16	35.1	13	33.4	18	29.6	16	16.6	8	16.0	8
Christian Reformed	100.0	2	35.3	6	17.6	3	50.0	12	41.7	10	8.0	2	0.0	0
Other Church	57.1	8	41.7	25	26.7	16	39.5	47	35.8	43	11.5	12	16.0	17
Non-religiously affil. Northeast	63.2	12	43.9	39	38.2	34	43.0	62	33.8	49	16.4	20	15.3	19
Non-religiously affil. South	53.3	8	31.8	21	26.9	18	33.0	34	28.8	30	6.7	6	10.1	9
Non-religiously affil. Other	46.2	6	38.6	27	24.7	18	40.4	36	27.8	25	10.8	9	19.8	17
NAIS Northeast	65.5	13	46.7	90	38.9	35	50.7	73	38.6	56	19.1	25	16.5	22
NAIS South	80.0	8	37.5	64	24.6	16	36.9	31	32.1	27	6.6	5	9.2	7
NAIS Other	49.9	8	39.8	88	25.3	23	38.8	45	33.3	39	13.3	14	21.9	23
NUCS	66.6	2	27.3	22	13.6	3	53.8	14	42.3	11	6.9	2	0.0	0
NACS	75.0	3	15.4	13	15.4	2	30.0	10	23.5	8	0.0	0	6.5	2

TABLE C

LACK OF RELEVANCE OF THEIR EDUCATION TO "THE REAL WORLD"

	Head of School		*Faculty*		*Faculty Believe Justified*		*Students*		*Students Believe Justified*		*Parents*		*Parents Believe Justified*	
RC Northeast	33.3	3	15.8	9	15.5	9	21.6	16	16.0	12	8.3	5	6.2	4
RC South	80.0	8	22.9	11	22.4	11	14.9	12	12.5	10	4.3	3	2.8	2
RC Other	60.0	6	25.0	13	25.9	14	18.8	13	19.7	14	0.0	0	0.0	0
Lutheran	40.2	2	28.6	6	28.6	6	35.9	14	20.5	8	9.3	3	9.1	3
Seventh-day Adventist	33.3	2	9.1	1	27.3	3	7.1	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	4.8	1
Jewish	66.7	2	0.0	0	28.6	2	33.3	5	37.5	6	6.7	1	20.0	3
Episcopal	16.7	1	33.3	12	32.4	12	35.8	19	35.2	19	17.0	8	14.0	7
Christian Reformed	50.0	1	31.2	5	64.7	11	20.8	5	16.7	4	8.0	2	4.0	1
Other Church	42.8	6	36.7	22	38.3	23	27.7	33	22.5	27	7.7	8	11.3	12
Non-religiously affil. Northeast	42.1	8	38.2	34	36.0	32	34.3	49	31.7	46	13.2	16	12.9	16
Non-religiously affil. South	26.7	4	21.8	14	32.8	22	20.6	21	19.2	20	4.5	4	7.9	7
Non-religiously affil. Other	61.6	8	31.4	22	28.8	21	31.9	28	24.4	22	4.8	4	5.8	5
NAIS Northeast	47.4	9	40.4	36	34.4	90	38.2	55	39.3	57	16.7	22	12.8	17
NAIS South	40.0	4	23.8	15	29.2	65	19.3	16	21.4	18	5.3	4	9.2	7
NAIS Other	50.0	8	40.9	36	37.4	91	37.4	43	30.8	36	9.6	10	12.4	13
NUCS	33.3	1	28.6	6	59.1	22	19.2	5	15.4	4	6.9	2	3.4	1
NACS	50.0	2	7.7	1	38.5	13	14.7	5	11.8	4	3.4	1	6.5	2

TABLE D

OVERLY STRICT REGULATION OF DRESS CODES AND HAIR STYLES

	Head of School		*Faculty*		*Faculty Believe Justified*		*Students*		*Students Believe Justified*		*Parents*		*Parents Believe Justified*	
RC Northeast	55.5	5	22.8	13	10.3	6	36.0	27	28.0	21	11.1	7	1.6	1
RC South	70.0	7	45.8	22	22.4	11	55.0	44	35.0	28	11.6	8	2.8	2
RC Other	50.0	5	33.4	18	14.8	8	35.8	25	23.9	17	7.9	5	3.1	2
Lutheran	40.0	2	57.1	12	33.3	7	33.3	13	20.5	8	9.1	3	3.0	1
Seventh-day Adventist	50.0	3	45.5	5	0.0	0	47.0	8	23.5	4	9.6	2	9.5	2
Jewish	0.0	0	42.9	3	14.3	1	26.6	4	12.5	2	0.0	0	6.7	1
Episcopal	50.0	3	62.1	23	32.4	12	64.8	35	33.3	18	25.0	12	4.0	2
Christian Reformed	50.0	1	35.3	6	17.6	3	54.1	13	29.2	7	12.0	3	4.0	1
Other Church	57.1	8	60.0	36	23.3	14	58.4	70	30.8	37	13.5	14	4.7	5
Non-religiously affil. Northeast	63.1	12	60.3	53	21.3	19	48.9	71	32.4	47	18.8	23	1.6	2
Non-religiously affil. South	26.7	4	55.4	36	16.4	11	55.4	56	37.5	39	5.7	5	1.1	1
Non-religiously affil. Other	92.3	12	48.5	33	23.3	17	57.3	51	38.9	35	8.4	7	0.0	0
NAIS Northeast			54.5	90	20.0	18	55.1	80	33.1	48	21.9	29	4.5	6
NAIS South			61.9	63	20.0	13	61.0	50	45.2	38	8.1	6	1.3	1
NAIS Other			59.3	86	28.6	26	65.5	76	41.0	48	16.2	17	1.9	2
NUCS			27.2	22	13.6	3	33.8	14	30.8	8	10.3	3	3.4	1
NACS			53.9	13	15.4	2	38.2	13	20.6	7	0.0	0	0.0	0

TABLE E

SCHOOL LIFE TOO TIGHTLY SCHEDULED AND REGIMENTED

	Head of School		*Faculty*		*Faculty Believe Justified*		*Students*		*Students Believe Justified*		*Parents*		*Parents Believe Justified*	
RC Northeast	22.2	2	19.3	11	24.1	14	41.3	39	32.0	24	11.1	7	12.5	8
RC South	40.0	4	20.4	10	18.4	9	29.5	23	22.5	18	14.4	10	16.9	12
RC Other	40.0	4	17.0	9	20.4	11	36.7	26	29.6	21	3.2	2	12.5	8
Lutheran	40.0	2	57.2	12	66.7	14	46.1	18	28.2	11	15.6	5	6.1	2
Seventh-day Adventist	83.3	5	18.2	2	9.1	1	17.6	3	5.9	1	4.8	1	4.8	1
Jewish	66.7	2	42.9	3	14.3	1	37.5	6	31.2	5	26.7	4	46.7	7
Episcopal	50.0	1	59.4	22	56.8	21	59.2	32	53.7	29	20.9	10	10.0	5
Christian Reformed	35.7	5	29.4	5	17.6	3	33.3	8	45.8	11	0.0	0	0.0	0
Other Church	36.9	7	58.4	35	38.3	23	42.5	51	28.3	34	14.7	15	13.2	14
Non-religiously affil. Northeast	36.9	7	63.7	56	37.1	33	41.3	59	28.3	41	15.6	19	11.3	14
Non-religiously affil. South	26.7	4	53.0	35	47.8	32	49.5	50	41.3	43	7.9	7	9.0	8
Non-religiously affil. Other	77.0	10	51.4	36	32.9	24	35.9	32	28.9	26	12.0	10	11.6	10
NAIS Northeast	47.4	9	66.3	89	47.8	90	49.7	72	37.2	54	19.9	26	11.3	15
NAIS South	30.0	3	57.8	64	52.3	65	53.6	45	45.2	38	10.7	8	13.2	10
NAIS Other	68.7	11	59.1	88	33.0	91	44.9	52	34.2	40	14.4	15	14.3	15
NUCS	33.3	1	36.3	22	18.2	22	30.8	8	42.3	11	0.0	0	0.0	0
NACS	25.0	1	23.1	13	23.1	13	20.6	7	8.8	3	0.0	0	6.5	2

TABLE F

COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE AT RELIGIOUS SERVICES

	Head of School		*Faculty*		*Faculty Believe Justified*		*Students*		*Students Believe Justified*		*Parents*		*Parents Believe Justified*	
RC Northeast	22.2	2	5.6	2	6.9	4	27.4	20	17.3	13	3.2	2	0.0	0
RC South	20.0	2	22.4	11	16.3	8	15.0	12	11.2	9	2.8	2	2.8	2
RC Other	0.0	0	9.3	5	5.6	3	25.4	18	8.5	6	6.4	4	1.6	1
Lutheran	20.0	1	28.5	6	19.0	4	61.5	24	30.8	12	9.1	3	0.0	0
Seventh-day Adventist	16.7	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	23.6	4	0.0	0	4.8	1	0.0	0
Jewish	0.0	0	42.9	3	14.3	1	12.4	2	6.2	1	6.7	1	6.7	1
Episcopal	66.6	4	40.5	15	18.9	7	64.8	45	38.9	21	12.5	6	6.0	3
Christian Reformed	0.0	0	5.9	1	0.0	0	12.5	3	8.3	2	4.0	1	0.0	0
Other Church	21.4	3	45.0	27	18.3	11	37.8	45	18.3	22	11.5	12	1.9	2
Non-religiously affil. Northeast	41.7	5	25.9	23	14.6	13	28.0	38	24.1	35	6.1	7	5.6	7
Non-religiously affil. South	10.0	1	26.6	17	13.4	9	29.7	30	14.4	15	1.2	1	0.0	0
Non-religiously affil. Other	12.5	1	4.5	3	1.4	1	5.8	5	6.7	6	1.3	1	2.3	2
NAIS Northeast	53.9	7	28.9	26	15.6	14	35.5	49	27.6	40	9.5	12	6.0	8
NAIS South	28.6	2	31.8	20	13.8	9	37.9	31	22.6	19	2.8	2	0.0	0
NAIS Other	36.4	4	16.7	14	6.6	6	24.8	28	16.2	19	7.1	7	3.8	4
NUCS	0.0	0	4.5	1	0.0	0	15.3	4	7.7	2	6.9	2	0.0	0
NACS	25.1	1	23.1	3	23.1	3	23.5	8	11.8	4	0.0	0	0.0	0

TABLE H

BOREDOM: DESIRE FOR MORE INTERESTING, VITAL TEACHING

	Head of School		*Faculty*		*Faculty Believe Justified*		*Students*		*Students Believe Justified*		*Parents*		*Parents Believe Justified*	
RC Northeast	44.4	4	19.7	11	15.5	9	41.9	31	38.7	29	9.8	6	10.9	7
RC South	90.0	9	34.6	17	24.5	12	36.7	29	30.0	24	13.0	9	11.3	8
RC Other	60.0	6	20.4	11	18.5	10	32.8	23	19.7	14	3.2	2	6.2	4
Lutheran	80.0	4	33.4	7	33.3	7	41.0	16	30.8	12	12.5	4	9.1	3
Seventh-day Adventist	50.0	3	18.2	2	18.2	2	17.7	3	17.6	3	0.0	0	0.0	0
Jewish	66.6	2	14.3	1	14.3	1	62.5	10	56.2	9	26.7	4	40.0	6
Episcopal	16.7	1	35.1	13	35.1	13	48.1	26	27.8	15	8.6	4	8.0	4
Christian Reformed	50.0	1	41.2	7	29.4	5	41.7	10	41.7	10	8.0	2	0.0	0
Other Church	38.5	5	33.4	20	23.3	14	33.6	40	20.0	24	8.6	9	11.3	12
Non-religiously affil. Northeast	44.5	8	27.0	24	16.9	15	47.6	67	31.7	46	16.1	19	12.1	15
Non-religiously affil. South	46.6	7	31.9	21	13.4	9	30.3	30	22.1	23	4.5	4	5.6	5
Non-religiously affil. Other	69.2	9	36.2	25	27.4	20	41.6	37	27.8	25	17.0	14	20.9	18
NAIS Northeast	42.1	8	32.2	90	21.1	90	52.5	75	34.5	50	18.0	23	13.5	18
NAIS South	50.0	5	29.6	64	10.8	65	29.2	24	14.3	12	1.3	1	2.6	2
NAIS Other	56.2	9	41.4	87	27.5	91	41.4	48	24.8	29	14.4	15	20.0	21
NUCS	33.3	1	36.4	22	31.8	22	46.2	12	42.3	11	6.9	2	0.0	0
NACS	66.6	2	15.4	13	15.4	13	20.6	7	17.6	6	0.0	0	0.0	0

TABLE Z

"JUSTIFIED" STUDENT GRIEVANCES, AS JUDGED BY STUDENTS, VIEWED GEOGRAPHICALLY

Grievance	*Northeast*			*South*			*Other Regions*		
	R.C.	*NRA*	*NAIS**	*R.C.*	*NRA*	*NAIS**	*R.C.*	*NRA*	*NAIS**
Lack of influence on policy	30.7 23	48.3 70	48.3 70	36.2 29	36.5 38	36.9 31	45.1 32	35.6 32	40.2 47
Poor faculty-student communication	36.0 27	33.8 49	38.6 56	33.7 27	28.8 30	32.1 27	43.7 31	27.8 25	33.3 39
Regimentation	32.0 24	28.3 41	37.2 54	22.5 18	41.3 43	45.2 38	29.6 21	28.9 26	34.2 40
Hair and dress codes	28.0 21	32.4 47	33.1 48	35.0 28	37.5 39	45.2 38	23.9 17	38.9 35	41.0 48
Boredom	38.7 29	31.7 46	34.5 50	30.0 24	22.1 23	14.3 12	19.7 14	27.8 25	24.8 29
Lack of relevance	16.0 12	31.7 46	39.3 57	12.5 10	19.2 20	21.4 18	19.7 14	24.4 22	30.8 36
Required religious services	17.3 13	24.1 35	27.6 40	11.2 9	14.4 15	22.6 19	8.5 6	6.7 6	16.2 19
Undue emphasis on college admission	26.7 20	29.0 42	32.4 47	12.5 10	26.9 28	29.8 25	18.3 13	22.2 20	27.4 32

*In addition to students from such church-related schools as Episcopal and Friends, this category includes some also appearing under NRA.